University of Alberta

The Didactic Demons of Drama:
Moral Instruction on Magic in the Plays of Greene and Gryphius

by
Richard G. Janzen

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Comparative Literature

Department of Comparative Literature, Religion, and Film/Media Studies

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring, 2000

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-60058-0

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Richard Gerald Janzen

Title of Thesis: *The Didactic Demons of Drama: Moral Instruction in the Plays of Greene and Gryphius*

Degree: Master of Arts

Year This Degree Granted: 2000

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material or digital form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Richard Gerald Janzen
8536 - 73 Avenue
Edmonton, AB
T6C 0E4

14.04.00

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned hereby certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, the thesis entitled *The Didactic Demons of Drama: Moral Instruction in the Plays of Greene and Gryphius*, submitted by Richard Gerald Janzen in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Comparative Literature.

Milan V. Dimic

Jonathan L. Hart

Julian Martin

23.iii.00

Abstract:

This thesis is a thematic analysis and comparison of Robert Greene's play, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (1589) and Andreas Gryphius' play, *Cardenio und Celinde, oder unglückliche Verliebte* (1649). The focus of the thesis is on the representation of magic and the occult within these dramas, specifically, on which forms of occult knowledge are presented as acceptable, and which are intolerable.

I broadly use a new historical approach, and examine the plays as didactic tools within the social bounds of Renaissance England and Baroque Germany. To effect this I provide a brief history of magic in chapter one, and then examine the forms of magic each author abhorred. In chapter two, I delve more deeply into the plays, and find that magic was such an inextricable part of life in that era that certain forms of it were tolerated, and perhaps even encouraged.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank first and foremost my parents and sisters for all of their love, support and, most especially, patience in helping me to complete this thesis. I would also like to express my gratitude my supervisors, Jonathan Hart and Milan Dimic, for their timely advice and encouragement and to Julian Martin for his valuable historical insights. I also owe thanks to my friends for listening to me whine, and for then telling me to shut up and get to work.

Special thanks to Hanna for being there to support my final drive to completion.

Contents:

Introduction:
Old Stories and Different Histories for the Plays of Greene and Gryphius 1

Chapter 1:
Magic's Historical Tradition and its Manifestation in Renaissance Drama 23

Chapter 2:
Ambiguous Stances by the Role Models in Gryphius' and Greene's Plays 58

Conclusion:
Curiosity and Ambition—Timeless Traits of Humanity 90

Notes 96

Selected Bibliography 105

Introduction: Old Stories and Different Histories for the Plays of Greene and Gryphius

The early modern period brought about new ways of examining the world, which, in turn, led to a re-assessment of many traditional values and ways of life. In the northern version of the "rebirth" movement which began in Italy, drama also played a significant role in displaying and sustaining the official ideologies of the time. The plays of Robert Greene (*c.*1558-1592) and Andreas Gryphius (1616-1664) supported the prevalent religious ideals of their era, namely of the Protestant churches in England and Germany, respectively, although as will be shown later, each author had very different reasons for endorsing them. Their propagation of official ideologies is very different than the plays of a rebel such as Christopher Marlowe, who was said to "jest at divine scriptures, gibe at prayers, and strive in argument to frustrate and confute what hath been spoke or writ by prophets and such holy men" (as quoted by J.B. Steane 1986, 14). The plays of Greene and Gryphius are in stark contrast to such open rebelliousness.

Greene is usually remembered as one of Marlowe's and Shakespeare's early peers, with his plays being widely seen in the theatres of London, which were among the most popular forms of entertainment of the day, and where he was one of the better-known and popular[1] playwrights. Greene is sometimes also remembered for criticising the upstart Shakespeare, as it appears in his *Groatsworth of Wit*, but as D. Allen Carroll (1994) notes, these portions may well have been written by Greene's publisher, Henry Chettle, rather than by Greene himself. Greene's plays are worthy of study in and of themselves, in terms of their literary merit, their place in the development of English theatre and the insight Greene brings to the values of English society of his day. Following Lyly, Greene and Marlowe, among others, played a vital role in establishing drama as one of the most prominent forms in entertainment in late Elizabethan society.

Gryphius is one of the founding fathers of the German[2] dramatic tradition[3], and although his writing style is formal and rhetorical, he is a product of his time and the values of that era. Prior to Gryphius' writing, most German dramas were written in "knittelvers", that is, rhyming verse with four stresses per line, lacking the sophisticated plots and textual construction modern theatre-goers have come to expect. Gryphius' literary ideals can, in large part, be traced to the pamphlet written by Martin Opitz in 1624, the *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey*[4]. Opitz sought to establish a German literary tradition, and the poetically-inclined Gryphius was happy to follow Opitz's example. As Judith Aikin observes in her survey of German Baroque drama, Opitz's ideas "constituted a model for the dramas of the High Baroque to which Gryphius and Lohenstein only needed to add a density of imagery, an augmented psychology of the passions—and the creative spark" (1982, 32). Gryphius uses a sophisticated plot and hexameter in his play, most likely an adaptation of the pentametric verse brought to Germany by travelling English theatre troupes, or the alexandrine line meter of the French drama of the time, which Gryphius learned from their manifestation in the Dutch drama of the era. His highlystructured plays are a reflection of his poetic efforts, as he is probably just as well known today as a lyric poet[5] as he is as a dramatist; he dabbled in many literary genres, and made himself familiar with a wide range of sources and stories[6].

Although these authors lived more than a generation apart, they and their respective societies had much in common. They both lived in an era of great religious and political turmoil, and in countries where the monarch had the power of life and death over the land and people. Both men were Protestant, which was in and of itself a form of departure from tradition and age-old religious attitudes. The Protestants contributed to a hardening of ecclesiastical authorities, of both Catholic and Protestant persuasions, against all matters occult, as will be shown later. These plays are culturally comparable and worthy of study in their small, but still significant, differences in how they treat the occult, and how they differ from "official" Church doctrine.

These two plays are good to study for a variety of reasons; Greene's play has obvious occult influences, and was written relatively early in the era of burgeoning professional London theatre. In its naiveté, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* (circa 1589) is similar to Gryphius' *Cardenio und Celinde* (circa 1649), which was penned for a theatre culture in which the majority of plays were still written and performed around religious holidays and town festivals. In essence, both plays were aimed at audiences whose sophistication was still growing, although the English crowds were much more aware of theatrics and the essentials of drama[7]. As Keith Wrightson argues, "By the early seventeenth century the unlettered majority of the English population were everywhere faced in one degree or another with the applications of literacy and the products of a literate culture" (1982, 195). This quotation shows the degree to which English culture concerned itself with education, and the cultural artifacts which accompany it. These crowds were aware of the potential for literacy, but the knowledge was still young.

Gryphius' play deserves attention because of the blatant depiction of the witch Tyche and the abominations she performs on the living and the dead. These scenes are in stark contrast to Bacon's attempt at a benevolent use of his magic, and the distinction is interesting to note and investigate. Also of interest in choosing these two plays are the lifestyles of the authors: Greene was infamous for his debauched values, while Gryphius lived his whole life as a model of Lutheran virtue. Yet these plays have strikingly similar attitudes towards magic and witchcraft; in this paper I will explain the nature of this correspondence. These plays for the most part condemn the use of magic and anything occult in any way, shape or form, but each of them also makes a small allowance for some expression of human curiosity and the desire to know about the grander scheme of the universe. This desire is allowed by each author, as long as it does not impinge upon God's ordering of the universe, and manifests itself only within proper, hierarchical boundaries.

The drama of each country was different in its concerns and style. Greene's drama was concerned largely with entertaining the audience, and if any moral edification of the populace could be brought about through the action on stage, so much the better. In essence, Greene was forced to give the people what they wanted, and for which they would be willing to pay[8]. German theatre of Gryphius' era was heavily influenced by the English travelling troupes which toured the continent in the early part of the seventeenth century, although that is difficult to notice in Gryphius' plays beyond his basic line structure. But the very fact that he was producing literary plays was brought about by a new appreciation in Germany for the potential of drama as a means of entertaining the people[9].

These English troupes were first brought to Germany in 1592 by Count Heinrich Julius von Braunschweig, who was a great lover of theatre, and who had previously seen a performance by English actors in Copenhagen. These troupes realised that there was money to be made in Germany as well as in Denmark, and began touring further south. As Judith P. Aikin notes, the English troupes "brought a theatre to Germany which, for the first time in the history of the German stage, was not directed and performed by amateurs" (1982, 20). She goes on to say that the theatrical effects of the itinerant stage ran counter to the Jesuit dramas, because "while the Jesuits used these methods in order to propagate the Faith, the professional theater troupes did so in order to make money. Their success was measured in profits, not conversions" (1982, 21). The professionalism of these actors and their need to amuse the audience to win profit were vital in pushing the German dramatic scene forward. There was a recognition of the capabilities of drama, and it suddenly became a more regular presence in people's lives, rather than something which the Jesuits did every Lenten season to mock magic and the Devil's attempt to woo mankind from the "straight and narrow"[10].

Both Gryphius and Greene wrote influential plays dealing with magic, but both of them had little direct contact with the occult tradition, either in the form of books or personal involvement, which could have, or perhaps even should have, figured prominently in these dramas. Greene's play *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* focuses on the demonic nature of magic, and the fact that even the most pious of men, in this case the monk Roger Bacon, can be tempted by the power offered by the devil. Bacon uses spirits to effect his magic, and accomplishes all of the wondrous feats by using demons to effect his commands. The play also serves as a possible precursor to Marlowe's Faustus figure, who does not repent as Bacon does, but both of the main characters lead their disciples down the path towards eternal damnation. This danger of perdition is one of the main impetuses behind the play, and Greene uses the figures in the play to warn his audience about the dangers of magic and witchcraft.

Gryphius' play *Cardenio und Celinde* continues with the task of admonishing the audience on the dangers of the occult, in which the two lovers of the title have strange experiences with preternatural forces. Cardenio sees a vision which leads him away from the place where he intends to murder his rival for Olympia's affections, while Celinde consults a necromancer who tries to force her to steal the heart from the corpse of her dead lover, at whose tomb she also sees a ghostly vision which frightens her back to faith in God. The play is heavily moralistic in its tone, almost serving as a sermon to the audience about the dangers of dealing with magicians and witches, which could lead to eternal damnation. Both of these plays serve the interests of the ecclesiastical authorities of their day, although for different reasons, as will be explored in chapter one of this discussion.

The role played by magic in society, and the role which it should play, was a sensitive topic in this early modern period; the religious authorities banned all forms of non-conformist religious teachings, and they included anything occultist[11] in their condemnation[12]. Richard Friedenthal notes that the topic of heresy, and magic as a part of that heresy, has always been controversial, and that

> (o)pinions on this varied greatly from century to century... Charges and counter-charges flew back and forth; popes and antipopes execrated each other as heretics... To cover sorcery and witchcraft the Dominicans in Cologne compiled their textbook *The Witches' Hammer*, and the first papal bulls on the subject were issued at the time of Luther's birth (1970, 246).

This statement shows that there was only the beginnings of a fixed and firm position by the Church at the time of the Reformation, although the Vatican, by issuing bulls on the matter, showed that it was of great concern. But since many of their own scholars were investigating occult matters, the Church was reluctant to damn everyone with their judgement of witchcraft. John Mebane argues that for this reason many scholars tried to "defend the orthodoxy of good magic (*magia)* and distinguish it from evil sorcery (*goetia*)" (1989, 32) in order to avoid the control of the Church[13].

The dramatists of the period often used magic as a tool which could be used for their ends, either as a means of winning popular success, or as a means of ingratiating themselves to the sacred authorities by proving their orthodoxy and loyalty to the Church, be the prevailing orientation Catholic or Protestant. In the first case, magic could be, and often was, used to entertain the audiences with supernatural events, or to get around constraints of time and place, such as in John Webster's play, *The White Devil*, in which a conjurer works on the stage to allow the character Brachiano see the murder of his wife, Isabella, as it happens (II, ii). But magic could also be used by dramatists of the period to prove their orthodoxy to sacred doctrine and Church dictates.

Both the Catholic and Protestant religious hierarchies were reluctant to make any distinction between the various types of occultist learning, and sought to damn them all simultaneously; this course of action was consistent with Luther's attitude towards witchcraft, as he himself made no distinction between simple village occultists who sought to control such things as the weather, and their far-removed counterparts, the well-educated hermeticists who sought to understand the mysteries of the universe (Russell 1980, 58). The Catholic attitude towards magic was influenced by the Protestant zeal in persecuting witches, and is also evident in their inquisitions throughout Europe and their textbook on the heresy of magic, the *Malleus Maleficarum*[14] (1487), which was produced before the Reformation and quickly became a concrete fact of Christian religious life[15]. Admittedly, there were Catholic inquistions and witch-hunts before the rise of Protestantism, but the competition of this new and powerful brand of heresy gave a new focus and sharpness to Rome's response to the perceived threat posed by witches.

Before discussing the role of magic in the Renaissance, I will attempt to clarify and define the various terms which I will use in this thesis. Many of the most common terms employed to describe such phenomena have been over-used to the point of meaninglessness, so I will describe only the most important nomenclature that I will use in this discussion[16]. "Occultism" is the over-arching term I will use to describe the dispersion of secret knowledge, usually done with the intention of controlling or influencing natural or preternatural powers. What I have defined as occultism is often the description of "magic", but by this term, I shall refer to the implementation of the science behind much of the philosophical occultist writings of the period and which formed part of its practitioners' belief in the order of the universe. The philosophical occultists (or "magi") generally believed in an archetypal god from whom the idea of the universe flowed, and who created the universe from the four elements of earth, air, fire and water. The magi practiced their magic when implementing their philosophy, or when they used their occultist knowledge in an active attempt to influence the order of the universe through the manipulation of the four elements out of which the universe is made.

"Witchcraft" and "sorcery" are, in my usage of the terms, the lowest of the forms of occultism, and the most practical. Sorcerers were those people who used spells and incantations to try to alter their physical environment; witches and warlocks[17] were those people who attempted to affect their environment and/or other people through sympathetic attributes of various items in their immediate vicinity, or through the manipulation of supernatural spirits, which could be either good or evil. As the terms "witch" and "witchcraft" became increasingly pejorative, witches[18] were automatically assumed to be in league with the devil and his evil assistants[19]. This type of knowledge was occultist in the fact that it was actively discouraged by the ecclesiastical authorities, and was therefore secretly passed from master to student; in contrast to popular opinion, occultists and practitioners of "high" magic tended to be among the most highly-educated people of their era, and those who sought to combine information from a wide variety of sources in an attempt to achieve unification with God. Most people of these societies, however, condemned all magi as witches, and many of the plays of this time catered to this attitude.

The social aspect of these plays is what I find most fascinating, because they were written with a very specific audience in mind, and had a distinct message which they were to communicate. Stephen Greenblatt describes this concern with the consideration of the social aspects of literature in the introduction to his ground-breaking work on early modern England, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*; in this book, he argues that "literature functions ... in three interlocking ways: as a manifestation of the concrete behaviour of its particular author, as itself an expression of the codes by which expression is shaped, and as a reflection upon these codes" (1980, 4). My admiration for this model does not imply that I propose a return to archaic methods of examining literature, in which one reads a drama or novel in one hand with a biography of the author in the other; but neither am I entirely content with analytical methods which seek to divorce a work of literature from the context which helped to create it. Particularly in the case of drama, an analytical method which separates the work from the performance for which it was intended seems counter-productive in respect to the social efficacies of the dramatic genre.

For these reasons, I think that Greenblatt's methodology[20] deserves closer examination; the first of his three approaches to a work of literature is useful in helping to contextualise the play. The reader is made aware of the historical and social setting within which a play is written; in the case of Greene, for example, the reader should be acutely aware that the moralising tone of his plays bears little relation to the author's own manner of living, which was, reportedly, hardly consistent with the accepted mores of his day. Rather than diminish the interest of Greene's plays, the reader may find his interest heightened, and use Greene's dramas as an archeological site to investigate the areas of overlap and divergence in individuals' public and private lives in the Elizabethan era.

The second facet of Greenblatt's method is an examination of the codes and social influences which help to dictate why an author would write a specific work, and for whom that work was intended. Gryphius, as far as modern scholars can ascertain, performed his play for the first time in an academy in Breslau[21], and would have surely been careful not to offend the minds of the school administrators or adversely affect the development of the young scholars who would perform the plays. Some elements of German society of the time regarded drama with suspicion[22], so any plays performed within the German classroom was necessarily an educational tool, and it would have to display its value as a device of civility, rather than debauchery. All of these concerns surely influenced the writing and performance of any play of the era.

In the third aspect of Greenblatt's proposal, we as readers are challenged to further examine how the text does not agree with orthodox views of a given era, and how the text engages with the accepted views of its day. One often learns more about a person and a society based upon what is not said and what is assumed, rather than what is in the text itself. While I admit that it is very dangerous to read too much into "what is not there", examination of the text and the society which produced it can provide useful fruit for speculation about why certain ideas are, or are not, presented in a given text. In the case of Gryphius, for example, we can analyze the extent to which he negotiates his moralistic position with the authorities of his Church; at first glance, Gryphius seems to acquiescé completely to the demands of his Church, but upon closer examination of his life, one discovers that he actually taught a course on chiromancy while in Leiden, and thereby displayed a more-than-passing familiarity with some of the occultist teachings of his day. This awareness encourages an even closer reading of the occultist portions of Gryphius' play, especially when coupled with the fact that he grew up during an era of witch-hunts and large-scale trials for diabolical affiliations[23].

The union of these three codes with which one examines a play and its interaction with the surrounding society provides not only a glimpse into the social realities of its day, but also gives one a deeper understanding of the text and the ways in which the text meshes with the social milieu in which it was written. In the case of the plays by Greene and Gryphius, both of them offer a view of what the audiences of the time desired from a play, and of what the playwright was willing to offer. The two impulses were rarely in perfect alignment, and it is interesting to note the points of concurrence and those of departure. In this discussion, I will examine closely the relationship between occultist teachings in the Renaissance period, and how they contrast with both the popular beliefs of the day, and their representation on stage for popular consumption.

Magic is used in both English and German drama of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by the orthodox authorities as a polemical tool. The most obvious of these were the Jesuit dramas of continental Europe, and notably in Germany. These plays were written and performed in Latin, and because of the language barriers to the audience, relied heavily on slapstick elements and farce to mock and deride practitioners of magic[24]. The magical tradition in European nations[25] began before the rise of drama as popular entertainment in their vernacular literary traditions, so that there was already a general awareness of magic and witchcraft at the point when vernacular theatre was produced. There is a long history of pacts with the Devil[26] or other ill-reputed powers in the history of world literature, and this tradition is especially prevalent within the Christian tradition, or other cultures with a dualistic world-view (Frenzel 1976, 644).

In England, the legend of Roger Bacon was popular, especially because in the Renaissance he was generally considered to have repented before his death for his associations with the illicit spiritual realms. In retrospect, he is considered to have been the greatest experimental scientist of his day, despite spending the last thirteen years of his life in jail for suspected diabolical affiliations. These accusations are themselves in dispute, and the only source containing this information is full of inaccuracies on other accounts. In Greene's era, Bacon was popularly considered (perception being more important than fact) to have been a necromancer[27]. Similarly, in Germany at the time the Faust legend became very popular and widespread; both stories are recorded in anonymously-written chapbooks in the mid- to late-sixteenth century, in which the Christian, condemnatory attitudes towards magic are most explicit. Both of these legends influenced the European traditions in which the plays which I will examine were written, but these plays are the end result of a long line of narratives written throughout Christendom, beginning shortly after Christ's crucifixion[28].

The causes for this prevalence within Christian literature are not difficult to trace, for the Devil, or one of his representatives, seeks to tempt Christ in the New Testament. The example of Christ's temptation and rejection thereof is to serve as guide to Christians in their efforts to follow Jesus' teachings. The story itself can be found in Matthew 4:1-11, and in essence, as with all diabolical pacts, the Devil offers Jesus an illegitimate means to an end. By this I mean that according to Christian beliefs, if Jesus were patient all that the Devil offers to Him would come without the Devil's assistance. The Devil tempts Jesus by offering Him a shortcut to the goals of power and wealth, but Jesus the Messiah refutes all of the arguments put forward by the Devil. Jesus remains true to His belief in His own destiny and that he is the son of God. Jesus believes that He will inevitably receive from God the Father all of the power, and more, that the Devil offers him.

The stories of Jesus' Apostles further advance the motif of infernal temptation with the story of Simon the magician, thenceforth known as Simon Magus. The legends surrounding him are many, but all can trace their origins to his appearance in the New Testament, Acts 8:9-24. In this story, Simon's attempt to purchase Christ's blessing and power from the apostles demonstrates his lack of true conversion to Jesus' teachings; Simon still conceives of power as a commodity which can be acquired and for which one can trade; in contrast to Simon, the apostles regard their power as a blessing from heaven beyond the comprehension of humans. Although the Bible does not record the incident, popular legend says that Simon Magus reverted to his conjurer's ways, and later competed with Peter and Paul in their attempt to found the Christian Church within the Roman empire (Palmer and More 1965, 29-34).

According to the legends of the early Church, especially in the *Clementine Homilies* and the *Clementine Recognitions* (Palmer and More, 10-11) a number of scenes are described in which Simon attempts to win the patronage of Emperor Nero. In this story, Simon seeks to use his "illegitimate" powers to gain the personal and/or political power of Nero's support. Peter and Paul denounce Simon's selfish pursuit of power; they feel that Christ, and not humans or humankind, should be honoured above all else. Although there is no explicit mention of a pact between Simon Magus and the Devil to acquire these powers, Peter and Paul see demons holding Simon above the Earth, and command these demons to depart, causing Simon to fall to his death. Peter and Paul use divine power to glorify Christ's name rather than themselves, meaning that within the Christian framework of the story, theirs is a legitimate use of preternatural power. This legend is not written to warn against the power of the Devil, but rather, to emphasise the power of faith in Christ; medieval stories went on to argue both the danger of temptation and the possibility of redemption.

One of the most popular and widespread legends to arise in medieval Europe was that of Theophilus of Adana; according to the *Legenda Aurea,* which was written circa 1290, Theophilus' (mis)adventure occurred in 537, and the story about him quickly spread throughout Europe, and circulated in almost every language (Palmer and More 1965, 59). According to the legend, Theophilus seeks to use the Devil's support to gain ecclesiastical powers, showing that even a good and pious person can be seduced by evil desires. This story stresses the value of redemption and faith in Christ, and His power to save the soul of a sinner. The reader, I can only assume, is expected to realise that human and hellish powers are still subject to the heavenly host, and that true power can only be achieved through faith in Christ. The story also serves to remind the audience that with true faith in Jesus (in this case through the Virgin Mary), one's sins can always be forgiven, no matter how grievous they may be.

The tradition of writing about the dangers of pacts with the Devil is continued in both England and Germany of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While German scholars have studied the origins of the Faust legend in minute detail[29], the popular legend of Roger Bacon is probably less known in English literary circles, despite also being published in the mid sixteenth century, although the earliest extant copies date from 1627 (Seltzer 1963, xii). This anonymously written chapbook has the full, and rather impressive, title of: *The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon. Containing the wonderfull things that he did in his Life: Also the manner of his Death; With the Lives and Deaths of the two Conjurers* Bungye *and* Vandermast, *Very pleasant and delightfull to be read.* Seltzer and Crupi both agree that this chapbook provided Greene with the basic story-line for his play[30]. The existence of this story shows the concern in England about the presence and dangers of magical knowledge, and proves that even the most pious of practitioners use, and therefore can be tempted by, the influence of the Devil. In this case, two of the three most powerful magi in the play are priests who must recognise that their proper place is a subservience to God. Bacon especially comes to learn, and in turn to teach Bungay, that they are playing with diabolical powers which can, in the end, do them nothing but harm. The story argues in favour of a simple faith in God, rather than risking the hubris of earthly might. In the story, Bacon is a

Franciscan friar and a man of God, and still almost loses his soul to diabolical powers, so by extension, a layman would run an even greater risk of daming himself, and must be correspondingly careful.

Greene, a prolific writer who was always in need of money, must have been aware of a demand for such scandalous stories, as he sought to capitalise, in every sense of the word, on the public desire to hear about the evils of magic and the dangers of learning. This idea was also picked up by Marlowe who dramatised the Faust story in a version which is generally better known to the literate public[31]. These two authors took advantage of the public's desire for titillation through topics considered to be forbidden; in this way, the public was able to have the best of both worlds, so to speak: they could have the entertainment value of the magic and conjuration, while at the same time go home with the self-righteous realisation that such magical acts had been justly condemned.

Bacon's story is not as detailed as the first known Faust story which was published in 1587; in this story, Faust's dealings with the Devil are made explicit throughout the story. The chronicler describes Faust's ambition to be as mighty as the Devil, but at the same time, argues that the Devil only pretends to be reluctant to obey Faust's commands. By the time Faust signs over his soul to perdition, he feels that he has tricked the Devil into giving him power, when it is really the Devil who has tricked Faust. This tale is much more blatantly polemical than *The Famous Historie*, but seemed to capture better the popular imagination, judging by its quick dispersal throughout Germany and the rest of Protestant Europe[32]. The story itself shows a transparent distrust of all things magical, and falls into the standard lack of differentiation between magic, witchcraft and book-learning in general.

In the *Faustbuch*, the Devil presents Faust with a book when he shows signs of regretting his decision, and thereby ensures his loyalty. Much of the knowledge sought by Faust is granted by the preternatural powers, and is therefore not the rightful property of mankind. In essence, this text is an attack upon the excessive learning of the universities, and expresses the fear that the universities are leading people away from a pious, simple knowledge of God. The value of such an unquestioning faith is demonstrated in both Greene's and Gryphius' plays.

Both the *Faustbuch* and *The Famous Historie* use many of the stereotypes associated with magic, conjuration and learning, but I will later explore this issue more fully in specific reference to Gryphius' and Greene's plays. The existence of such stories prior to the plays and their performances indicates that there was both a public concern with magic and its influences, as well as an appetite to hear such tales. In the case of the story about Roger Bacon, the audience could also feel a sense of patriotic well-being, as he was a famous Englishman whose soul was almost captured by the Devil, but who recognised the error of his ways and repented before it was too late. In this way, *The Famous Historie* falls nicely into the medieval, Catholic tradition of Theophilus and other churchmen who repented of their errors in time, and were saved through the mercy of God and the love of Christ. In contrast to

Bacon's story, Faust's has none of the nationalistic overtones, but expresses a universal distrust of ambition and the danger of seeking personal enlightenment. This theme can also be found in *Cardenio und Celinde*, and the concern with dangerous forms of knowledge is graphically depicted in this play, where Tyche is a figure of great evil whose original fall was, like Adam and Eve's, caused by the desire to know too much.

There was a general air of distrust in this era, as it was a time of great uncertainty, in both the religious and the social institutions[33]. Much of the religious uncertainty revolved around the open conflicts between the Roman Church and the breakaway groups of Protestants, although almost all of the Reformationists were precisely that: they wanted to reform the Church, and not to separate from it[34]. But for political reasons as much as religious ones, the Protestant movement gained strength and moved away from the Pope and his Church. With this religious differentiation, dynastic struggles also became, for all sides, struggles to defend religious truth. In England there were transitions back and forth between Catholicism and Protestantism, in the mid fifteenth century, which only settled down during the formative years of Greene and his contemporaries; although England was Protestant for Greene's entire life, this new version of Christianity still required them to be subservient to whatever the accepted mode of behaviour was for their day. Similarly, but in an even more extreme situation, Gryphius grew up with the horrors of the Thirty Years War, where Germany served as the battleground for Europe's political and religious conflicts[35]. He also lived as a Protestant in a violently Catholic region, and understood all too well how poorly Christians could treat one another.

Spahr confirms this attitude towards the instability of the times when he quotes from a contemporaneous writer, the epigramist Logau, who says, "Luthrisch/ Päbstisch und Calvinisch/ diese Glauben alle drey/ Sind verhanden; doch ist Zweiffel/ wo das Christentum dann sey" (1993, 6). This statement, intended likely as humour, carries a great deal of weight, in the fact that it captures the religious uncertainty of the times. Each side of the Christian triangle in Western Europe depicted its claims to hold the key to Truth, but the citizens of that era must have realised that all three could not be as righteous as each side asserted[36]. I can only imagine that such a confused state of religious affairs could only inspire three options: indifference, despair, or fanaticism. Indifference would then be manifested in those people who follow what they are told or what they have always done, despair would be prevalent in those people who follow all sides of the debate and cannot determine who is correct; fanaticism would be the response of those people who sought to avoid despair and clung to a particular side in the Reformation theological battles.

The *Faustbuch* and *The Famous Historie* are indications of a large social concern with the morality of witchcraft in an era of amorality and uncertainty[37]. The fact that two such similar documents were written in different countries, 40 years apart, indicates an on-going concern and widespread preoccupation with the topic. These chapbooks provide a privileged glimpse into the mind-set of a middle-class reader of the Renaissance/Baroque period.

These readers were surrounded by accusations of witchcraft, admittedly less severe in Greene's England than in Gryphius' Germany (Russell 1980, 90-97), and fears of being surrounded by evil spirits. It was also an age of great spiritual uncertainty, in which many people left the traditional religious institutions to found their own branches[38]. This new freedom of spiriutality led some of those people to believe that they had found the one true path to religion, while others seemingly went through a crisis of faith, and did not know which path they should follow, or if any path was the right one to take, as noted in the quotation from Logau. It was in this atmosphere that Greene and Gryphius wrote their plays, and each of these plays offers valuable insights into some of the concerns with which their respective societies wrestled.

Chapter One: Magic's Historical Tradition and Its Manifestation in Renaissance Drama

> The Devil is the best-known symbol of radical evil. The existence of radical evil is clear to anyone."
>
> - (Jeffrey B. Russell 1986, 1)

That "evil" exists in the world seems to depend only upon one's definition of the word, but from where this evil comes is open to debate in modern society. For the society of the Renaissance and Baroque eras, that this evil was embodied in the figures of the Devil and his minions is beyond question. While some scholars feel that the rise of atheism first began in earnest during this period, I think that most, or even all, of the people of this era believed in God, but questioned His involvement in the daily workings of the world. As John Guy notes, many people "were accused of denying Christ's divinity, the Resurrection, and even God's existence, though it is doubtful whether anything approaching 'atheism' in the modern sense can be identified before the eighteenth century" (1988, 414). To deny God's presence in each action of humanity would have been in itself a sacrilege, and although a mild form of agnosticism by present standards[1], in that era such an attitude would surely have been highly scandalous, and some would even argue impossible. This explanation accounts for playwrights such as Greene, Marlowe and the other University Wits, whom various critics have regarded as ranging from being complete atheists to pious Christians. These are attitudes which are projected backwards, rather than being extracted from the writings of the day.

The writings of Robert Greene and Andreas Gryphius provide modern readers of the Renaissance with many valuable insights into the prevailing attitudes of their era. Greene's life provides us with a glimpse into the sordid side of late sixteenth-century London, while his repentance writings, the verisimilitude of which will be explored later, provide the reader with a look at the public mores of the day. In contrast to Greene, Gryphius' life shows the student of his era the piety and suffering which were omnipresent in his life and country.

In Greene's drama *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, he provides us with a good look at how his contemporaries saw the Devil in the world around them, and the threat that he posed. By using stereotypes of the magus, in this case the figures of Roger Bacon, Thomas Bungay and Jacques Vandermast, Greene's play attempts to persuade his audience that magic is evil, and can lead to perdition. Andreas Gryphius' play *Cardenio und Celinde* gives the reader an excellent idea what the prevailing notion of the witch was in Germany of that time, and how God was a constant presence in the Lutheran world of the seventeenth century. Before examining how Renaissance Europe envisioned the Devil's workings, I would like to establish the authors' credentials for commenting on the social attitudes of their day.

Andreas Gryphius has experienced somewhat of a renewed academic interest over the past thirty or so years in scholarly circles[2]; this is only right and fitting, granting him the place in German literary history which he enjoyed during his lifetime. Today he is known both for his lyric poetry, much of which describes the horror of life during the Thirty Years War, as well as his plays, which have been receiving increasing critical attention[3]. Gryphius' dramas all have a heavily didactic and moralistic tone[4], in which he decries the vanity of earthly existence and the need to focus our attentions on the joys of the heavenly kingdom. In his play *Cardenio und Celinde, oder, Unglückliche Verliebte*, Gryphius focuses some of his moralising energies on the dangers of the occult, and the dangers of spiritual witchcraft. This warning against forbidden knowledge is wrapped in a sermon on the proper avenues and expressions of love. Gryphius differentiates between good and bad forms of occult knowledge, just as there are proper and improper expressions of love; there are spirits present throughout the plays, and Gryphius shows through the figure of the witch, Tyche, how the use and manipulation of spirits is wrong and damnable, but that a mere desire to know God, through his messengers, is acceptable. Olympia is the character who best demonstrates this aspect of occult knowledge as she seeks passively to understand God's will. At the conclusion of the play both Cardenio and Celinde, through the intervention of divine messengers, come to an awareness and acceptance of God's will and plan for their respective lives.

All of the critics whom I have read agree, to varying degrees, that Gryphius was a staunch Lutheran who oftentimes used his writing as a polemical tool to denounce the vanity[5] he saw in the world[6]. Unfortunately, only recently has there been anything further added to this too-broad and one-dimensional generalisation of Gryphius' work. Hugh Powell's introduction to the play is a good beginning, but one which was not followed by any other critical work of note, and only recently have any critics followed the path blazed by Powell. Judith P. Aikin wrote a survey of the authors of this period in 1982, in which Gryphius naturally figured prominently, and, more recently, Blake Lee Spahr has written several articles and a book on Gryphius titled: *Andreas Gryphius, A Modern Perspective* (1993). Both of these critics, though, are concerned with introducing their audience to this "new" writer, and so become bogged down in plot summaries and trite generalisations, rather than engaging the problematic aspects of the texts. Both Aikin and Spahr expend much of their energy explaining that this is a very early example of a play written about and for the middle class. As Gryphius himself apologises in the "Vorrede", "(d)ie personen ... sind fast zu niedrig vor ein trauer-spiel" (1961b, 264). With such bourgeois concerns, it is difficult to find any serious discussion of the figure of Tyche, or the role of magic within the play. With the exception of the article by Thomas Best (which will be discussed later), there is no real analysis of Tyche's character, except that she is obviously evil[7]. There is a disappointing lack of discussion of her interaction with, and relationship to, the other characters in the play, and specifically, to the lovers and their various intrigues which come to the fore during the play.

Similarly, there has been surprisingly little written about Greene's play, and even less about the presentation of magic within the drama, despite the central role this "nigromancy" plays. Many of the critical commentaries on Greene focus on his repentance writings, and if they do make mention of his plays, are of a cataloging nature. Charles W. Crupi's book on Greene, for example, has only a twelve-page discussion of this play, despite Crupi's admission that it is Greene's best-known drama. The best articles on the topic of magic in the play are by Frank Towne and Albert Wertheim: both of these articles reject any notion that Bacon's art can be called benevolent, or theurgical in nature, unlike Robert West's article from the first half of this century[8]. While Bacon's repentance speech is honest in his display of contrition, West projects this attitude backwards, and argues that Bacon follows in Agrippa's footsteps and uses "good" spirits to force the "bad" spirits to perform his commands. As will be discussed later in this thesis, Agrippa's distinctions between the various types of spirits are dubious, at best. I can only agree with both Towne's and Wertheim's interpretations of the play, namely, that Bacon's art is diabolical in nature, and that he must repent at the end of the play to save his very soul, and the souls of those around him.

Not much is known of Greene's early life, and as Crupi notes, Greene may have been born to a saddler in Norwich or to a hosteler in Yorkshire (1986, 5); both are equally plausible explanations, and each would explain much about Greene's wide range of experiences and attitudes in the universities and later in London, but neither history entirely satisfies all of Greene's commentators[9]. The paper trail following Greene improves during his university days, and biographers such as Crupi and J. Churton Collins are reasonably sure that he graduated with a MA from Cambridge in 1583, and received an Oxford MA in 1588.

While studying in Cambridge, Greene almost certainly associated with the upper classes of English society, although he himself was only able to study thanks to a sizar's scholarship[10]. This discrepancy in lifestyles between Greene and his classmates surely caused some distress to Greene, but his new social circle did introduce him to a new way of looking at the world. Greene moved on to London after working at Oxford for a time[11], and began his life as a professional writer there. Scholars associate Greene at this time with the "University Wits", that is, that group of young men who came from lower- to middle-class homes, but who had the education and social ambitions of the ruling elite[12].

One of the original men to fall into this mode was John Lyly, who received two master's degrees, but was forced to write in order to support himself. Crupi writes that Greene's literature was heavily influenced by Lyly, and that their lives had many parallels in terms of their personal histories, although there is no evidence they were close friends in any way. The links between Greene's *Mamillia* and Lyly's *Euphues* are well documented, but as Charles Hieatt argues in his essay on the sources of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, the structure of this play closely follows that of Lyly's *Campaspe*. This link is simply further evidence of the strong influence Lyly wielded over his successors, and of the University Wits' debt to Lyly's themes and techniques.

These Wits were often forced to become writers, because there was little else which they were qualified to do. In other words, they were banned from the social circles in which they had circulated during their university days, and were shut out from any avenues to power, or even a secure administrative position with the government; these routes which were jealously guarded by the social elites of the day and given only to those writers who were lucky enough to find a patron[13]. In the case of Lyly, Joseph W. Houppert notes that Lyly was "rejected for almost every significant position ... for which he sued throughout his career" (1975, 13). The other young men following Lyly's lead had equally good educations, and were convinced, as Lyly was, that they had risen above their lowly beginnings, but they were unable to gain the positions of power and influence which they felt they deserved; many of them took to writing all manner of pamphlets and plays to earn their keep. Each of these young men was trying to carve his own path, torn between their lowly families and wealthy university friends. Because the University Wits were caught between these two opposing social spheres, they were constantly negotiating their social position with the world around them, a feat which provided these writers with a unique perspective on their environment and the times in which they lived. In Greene's case, he lived in relative poverty in London, but knew how to comport himself in high society, and through his university experiences was familiar with the attitudes of the upper classes.

Greene was caught between two social worlds: the dream of equality and power from his university days, and the life of social and professional frustration which he lived in London. Much of the speculation on Greene's life in London is gleaned from his prose writings[14], most of which urge repentance of some sort for any number of vices. The best known of his prose works, *Greens Groatsworth of Wit*, *Greens Repentance* and *Greens Vision* are all used to provide details about Greene's life, and are often assumed to be largely autobiographical. As all three were published after his death, I am more sceptical than many of his other commentators in accepting the episodes presented there as autobiographical fact, but it is reasonable to assume that even if Greene did not participate in the unscrupulous activities suggested in these tracts, he at the very least had a number of acquaintances who did. Having kept such company, Greene would have been more than able to appraise the society around him, both its more cultured segments, through his university affiliations, and the underbelly of society through his familiarity with the less respectable elements of London life.

Greene's chronic problems with money have been better documented than many other details of his personal life, and he was quoted as saying that he didn't care about the truth or acclaim of his writings, as long as they brought him money. All accounts, both those attacking and those defending Greene, indicate that he had problems supplying himself with money, and tended to write what would sell. Thomas Nashe, one of Greene's posthumous defenders, admitted that Greene "made no account of winning credit by his works. ... His only care was to have a spell in his purse to conjure up a good cup of wine at all times." (Jordan 1965, 2-3). This concern with popularity makes Greene a useful appraiser of his society, because it means that he would write opinions and stories he thought people would want to hear, rather than ones which he thought were purely artistically appealing.

Further evidence of Greene's pre-occupation with money and good times is found in his chapbook, *Never too Late*. Greene's preface promises that this will be the last of his trifling works and that it was only told in an effort to wean young men from their wicked ways; the story, however, sold so well that several similar tales followed, such as *Francescos Fortunes* and *Farewell to Follie*. All of these prose stories achieved good sales, and drama was apparently a similarly lucrative enterprise, because in one of Greene's narratives, the young Francesco meets a wealthy actor, who convinces him to write plays and make money, which he does with great success. Whether or not one wishes, as Nashe did, to say that Greene wrote plays only for money, as a dramatist he would have known if there was money to be made in such an enterprise, and in his personal situation would do everything in his power to earn it; modern readers can learn from Francesco's fate, for it seems apparent that many other playwrights, and not just Greene, received their motivation to write drama through the desire to earn money.

In the end, one cannot directly prove that what Greene wrote in his prefaces or plays is a direct reflection on his life, or that the stories themselves necessarily reflect his opinions; however, as a man with a foothold in a variety of social circles in London, Greene apparently knew what the diverse social groups of his day desired from the theatre, and wrote to feed the popular appetites, thereby giving the people what they wanted and would be willing to pay for. Greene seems to have been more concerned with giving the audience what he thought they wanted, rather than attempting to impose his views upon them; this tendency makes Greene a marvelous commentator on his times, and even if the ideas presented in his works were not the overwhelming attitudes of his day, these attitudes were nonetheless perceived by Greene to be the dominant mode of thought, and public morality is at least as useful for study as private opinion[15].

Having established Greene's credentials as a fit commentator on London and English society, that is, one with a toehold in a wide range of social and academic circles, I would like to move to his play, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. I will examine how Greene depicts magic in the play, and how this depiction is a reflection of the attitudes of his day and the contemporaneous society. Elizabethan society certainly did not see a play as purely entertaining, but rather as a production which sought both to instruct and to please[16]. The moralising tone of Greene's play is perfectly consistent with the values and expectations of his times; Houppert states that "(m)ost of what passes for fiction in the late sixteenth century suffers from ... moralization" (1975, 15). The quarto edition of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, published in 1594, ends with Horace's maxim: "*Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci* [He has won every vote who has mixed profit with pleasure]" (as quoted and translated in Wertheim 1974, 273). Again, as this play was published after Greene's death, modern readers must be cautious in attributing this Horatian motto to Greene, especially as it was one of the more popular maxims of the era. Or if it is Greene's philosophy of literature, one must be cautious not to over-emphasise its importance: it is very possible that Greene used it as his motto in order to win public approval, and thereby sell more books. This explanation of Greene's motivations will be used later in this discussion, for many problems arise when one attempts to attribute too much authorial intent to Greene's presentation of Friar Bacon's character.

The play itself revolves around Bacon in a series of seemingly unrelated episodes: the central concern of the play is the finding of one's proper place in the world, or Chain of Being, to use the terminology most commonly applied to the hierarchical universe of the era[17]. The most obvious people discovering their rightful places are the young lovers: Lacy and Margaret, and Edward and Eleanor. Prince Edward tries to use Bacon's power to win Margaret as his concubine, but gives up the effort when he realises that his duty is to take Princess Eleanor of Castile in faithful and Christian marriage. Edward also bows to the realisation that Lacy and Margaret truly love each other, and that he would betray the nobility of his birth to deny them this love.

A parallel plot involves the famous Friar Bacon recognising what his proper place in the divine order is. While he aids and hinders the young lovers almost as a sport, his real aim lies in winning glory for himself, and vicariously, for his country. To please the king, Bacon pits his skill against that of the Castilian king's sorcerer, Jacques Vandermast[18], who is thoroughly defeated in the contest. But to win even more honour and glory for himself, Bacon privately seeks to give life to a bronze head which he has fashioned. There is a long history of magi creating talking heads in European occultism, and even the great medieval scholar Albertus Magnus reportedly created one, amongst many other such legends[19]. These heads could reportedly tell of events both past and future, and its creation would be a triumphant feat for any magus. In the case of this play, the head symbolises Bacon's hubris, and his work is brought to nought due to the negligence of his subsizar, Miles, in watching over it, or rather, not doing so at a crucial moment.

Miles is an earthy character who represents Everyman, and has no awareness or knowledge of the powers Bacon is manipulating. He is more concerned with creature comforts and does not have the fortitude necessary to reject the temptations of the Devil, as will be discussed later. After the destruction of the head, Bacon's powers lead to another ruinous event, in which four characters are killed due to the power of his prospective glass. Friar Bacon then recognises the dangerous and damaging nature of his magic, and foreswears all of his occult powers and knowledge.

Friar Bungay, although mentioned in the title of the play, is a character of much less obvious importance than Friar Bacon. Bungay is a follower and admirer of Bacon; as a historical figure, he was Bacon's superior within the Franciscan hierarchy in England and hence, must have at least tacitly supported Bacon's activities (Easton 1970, 187-88). Within the context of the play, however, Bungay represents the influence Bacon has on the academic and religious community around him, even those considered by the Church to be Bacon's superiors. Bungay tries to help, and even to emulate Bacon, albeit with considerably less proficiency. Although he helps Bacon create the bronze head, Bungay is dominated by Bacon's preternatural powers throughout the play; where Bungay is unable to overcome Vandermast in a contest of necromantic skill, Bacon effortlessly routs his Flemish counterpart (ix). Similarly, Bungay's religious and academic attitudes are heavily influenced by Bacon's actions, and he follows Bacon's lead, as in their enterprise with the bronze head. In order to prevent the damnation of Bungay, Greene has Bacon repent of his way of life, and thereby save not only himself, but his follower as well.

Gryphius had an ambiguous relationship to the occult, if one is to judge by his plays and personal history, and to measure his plays as a reflection of Gryphius' character would not be inappropriate. Unlike Greene, who wrote plays in order to earn money, Gryphius wrote his plays for the moral edification of his audience[20]. As Judith Aikin notes in her discussion of Gryphius' play *Carolus Stuardus*, his plays were written "to convince the audience of the rightness of his (Gryphius') views" (1982, 51). He makes his opinions patently obvious throughout his plays, and they are all theologically and morally so didactic that they are almost nauseating to the modern reader. The very fact that he would insert such sermons into the middle of his plays[21] indicates that he expected these views to be shared by his audience; these plays were performed in Silesian *Gymnasien*, or, "academies[22]". In such a setting, the school community, as well as the community at large, would surely have taken steps to ensure that only edifying productions were staged in their hallowed halls. If Gryphius had an ambiguous relationship with the occult, it is certainly more than possible that the society as a whole had a poorly-defined understanding of the occult, and its role within their society[23].

Gryphius himself was a very well-travelled man, and quite cosmopolitan in his world-view. He was born and largely raised in the German-speaking region of Silesia, in what is presently Poland, and grew up under the spectre of the Thirty Years War. This region was one of the most harshly affected by the almost constant religious/political[24] fighting; he was a Protestant who grew up in a regime whose ruler consciously sought to ensure that the populace remained Catholic, or were brought back to the Roman Church. Gryphius later joined the court of Ferdinand IV to act as a liaison between this Catholic ruler and the Protestant citizenry of Silesia, who lived under the fear of persecution as the government attempted to "recatholicise" the region.

A casual reader of Gryphius' biography might believe that he "sold out" his ideals to gain a preferment at court, but I find Spahr's argument (1993, 14-15) much more convincing, when he states that Gryphius deliberately chose this difficult role, and in no way to legitimise the government; instead, he sought to protect his fellow Protestants (or simply his fellow people) by tempering, or attempting to moderate, the dictates of the court. This kind of engagement with the world is much more consistent with Gryphius' disgust with the vanity of the world, and of many of his fellow human beings; his writings encourage other people to do things which would make a difference, and which would please heaven. Given Gryphius' engagement with the world around him, and the moralising tone of most of his writings, he surely wrote in an attempt to influence society around him, and lived in such a way, as well.

As noted above, Gryphius is often remembered today as a lyric poet who captured the essence of the horror of war, but in his own day, he was primarily regarded as a dramatist who also dabbled in poetry. After his death, he was mourned as Germany's greatest dramatist of the era, and many of his colleagues even referred to him as the "Teutsche Sophokles." Today, this praise seems to be hyperbolic, but much of our modern bias against Gryphius' style is found in our preference for psychological drama with a clear narrative structure and much dramatic tension. For example, the very events described by Cardenio in the opening act seem to be, from a modern standpoint, the stuff of great drama, with its combination of conflict, love and intrigue. In frustration of present-day expectations, Gryphius has his character describe these events in what seems to us a virtual monotone, to a friend who should already know the history of his friend's love-life. As Spahr points out in his introduction, Gryphius did not seek to build dramatic tension, but rather, used his play as a vehicle to display rhetorical prowess. He argues that Gryphius' dramas "were conceived within the framework of baroque eloquence, rather than with regard to dramatic tension" (1993, ix). This baroque style of eloquence can make Gryphius' plays tedious to modern readers, but his very dedication to the styles and fashions of his day proves Gryphius' involvement with, and awareness of, contemporary ideas and attitudes. He spent much of his adult life in the universities of Europe, as well as working for the aristocracy, and his wide range of experiences make Gryphius a very able commentator on his society, with an awareness of the thoughts and attitudes of a significant cross-section of society.

Gryphius began his life under very trying circumstances, with many different parents and step-parents, all of whom cared for him with varying degrees of ardour and success. As Spahr, Gryphius' most thorough biographer, notes, Gryphius' father died when he was four, his mother died when he was eleven and his step-mother, for whom he seems to have had a real fondness, passed away when he was twenty-one. Gryphius' relationship with his step-father was also not always amicable, for he later accused his step-father of stealing money which belonged by rights to Gryphius (Spahr 1993, 6-9). He attended an academy in Glogau similar to the one at which he would later work in Breslau, and completed his studies with such success that he was able to go on and became tutor to the children of Georg Schönborn. He introduced the young Gryphius to a new social and intellectual circle, and according to Spahr, a real intimacy sprang up between the two. Gryphius' association with Schönborn had far-reaching effects, because Schönborn granted him the title of Master of Philosophy. With this title, Gryphius acquired the *venia legenda* needed to teach at any university in Europe; he took advantage of this situation, accompanied Schönborn's sons and went with them to Leiden to study law.

Gryphius' time in the Netherlands was well-spent; it introduced him to a wide range of new ideas[25] and philosophers, as well as to the thriving literary and dramatic scene in the Netherlands at the time. Aikin and Spahr have both noted the strong influence Dutch writers such as Vondel, Hooft and Bredero had on Gryphius, especially since he later translated Vondel's play *De Gebroeders* into German, but which was only published posthumously[26]. These Dutch writers provided not only dramatic material and ideas for the young Gryphius, but also made him realise, as Martin Opitz did in the previous generation, that there was a real possibility of a vernacular theatre. Earlier German models were either in Latin, as the Jesuit dramas were, or in *Knittelvers*, or "doggerel", like the simple but entertaining dramas of the Nürnberg playwright, Hans Sachs.

Gryphius also used his Leiden connections to secure a position as a paid escort to Wilhelm Schlegel, the son of a rich merchant. Gryphius accompanied Schlegel and his companions on a tour through Europe, spending a considerable time in Italy[27]. It was during this visit that Gryphius surely came across the source for his play, *Cardenio und Celinde*[28]. Although Gryphius describes the story in his introduction as a "wahrhafte Geschichte", commentators like Hugh Powell argue that there are too many exact correspondences between Gryphius' story and the Italian version of the story for it to have been orally transmitted and retold years later. Gryphius, in all probability, took a written version of the novella and transformed it into a play designed for the moral edification of his countrymen[29].

The characters in Gryphius' play are not historical figures as they are in Greene's, which limits this discussion of the play to the plot itself, without trying to balance the demands of "real" history to the history constructed within the play. It begins with Cardenio describing the history of his tempestuous and ill-fated love for Olympia. After several disputes and reconciliations with Cardenio, Olympia married Lysander, who had waited patiently in the wings amidst Olympia's turbulent affair with Cardenio. He then feels that he was betrayed by Olympia and cheated by Lysander out of his love, and vows to kill Lysander. Nonetheless, Olympia's rejection does not stop Cardenio from getting involved with Celinde, who was a kept woman of a (supposedly) chaste knight, Marcellus. In a confrontation with his rival, Cardenio kills Marcellus and sensibly realises that he must leave the city. Celinde cannot bear to part from her lover and enlists the aid of the witch Tyche to aid her in winning Cardenio's undying love.

Under Tyche's orders, Celinde goes to Marcellus' crypt to steal the heart from his corpse. Meanwhile, Cardenio is distracted from his plotted ambush of Lysander by a figure who looks like Olympia leaving her home. Cardenio follows this figure until they reach a secluded garden, where the figure reveals its true form as the Angel of Death. When Cardenio awakens from his fright, he stumbles upon Celinde in Marcellus' crypt, where she, in turn, had just been confronted by his ghost, and told to change her sinning ways. Their horrifying experiences convince Cardenio and Celinde that they are on the wrong path, and they vow to repent of their transgressions. They share their revelations with Olympia and Lysander, and all of the characters leave the stage praising God and advising the audience to contemplate death and the hereafter.

As noted earlier, the issues of religion and spirituality were closely interconnected at this time, so before going too far into a discussion of the occult in these plays, I will briefly survey the main figures of the Renaissance academic tradition of the magi[30]. I would also like to offer a disclaimer regarding the differences between Catholics and Protestants of this era. Each side of the Reformation battles accused the other of some manner of paganism and witchcraft, much of which can now be dismissed as political and religious rhetoric. Stuart Clark argues that for the Catholics, heresy and witchcraft can be linked and traced all the way back to the acts of the Apostles in the New Testament, so it was easy for them to accuse the heretic Protestants of witchcraft (534). This statement builds upon his earlier point that it made "it much more likely that, from the 1520s onwards, the writers on demonism in each religious party would seek for witchcraft in the ranks of their (religious) enemies" (362).

The inner circle of magi of this era seems to have been above such distinctions, however, as displayed by the Protestant John Dee's time (circa 1583-1589) at the Prague court of the Catholic emperor Rudolf II, or by Giordano Bruno's academic excursion from Catholic Italy to Protestant England, also coincidentally in 1583. In such a liberal circle, Greene would have no excuse for using Catholics as scapegoats in the popular debate on witchcraft, but, as noted earlier, Greene was not catering to any academic reality, but rather to popular appetites. Hence, his plays did not need to bear any relation to the intellectual reality of his day and the lack of confrontation between Catholic and Protestant magi, within the context of the tradition upon which men like Dee and Bruno were trying to build. Two of the most important magi of the early modern period were Marsilio Ficino and Giovannni Pico della Mirandola[31], both of whom, like the historical Bacon, were Catholic churchmen, and whose writings were respected by Catholic and Protestant magi alike.

One of the first academics of the Renaissance who could be called a humanist philosopher[32] was Marsilio Ficino[33], who played a crucial role in re-introducing Plato to European readers[34]. Ficino was a scholar of ancient Greece and one of the first people in the Renaissance to translate Plato's treatises into Latin, which contributed to the revival of interest in Greek philosophy other than that of Aristotle. As students of the early modern period, we must recognise the importance of the blending of Platonic and Christian ideas by the leading philosophers of the era. This fusion of thought is especially apparent in the writings and personal history of Ficino, who simultaneously translated Plato's works and the writings attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, whose ideas he also incorporated into the Christian tradition[35].

Ficino's writings contained a pattern which later occultists found especially appealing: his unique combination of Platonic, Hermetic and Christian humanist thought[36]. Ficino based much of his philosophy on the idea of the perfectibility of humankind, which was one of the tenets of radical humanism (Mebane 1989, 10), and he sought to unify ancient knowledge with Christian teachings, even through the use of astrology and talismans. As this quotation from his *Three Books of Life* shows, he used a wide variety of sources in formulating his views of the universe; to maintain health, he says,

> Trismegistus tells of such things too, which the Egyptians made out of certain things of the world in order to get strength. He says they used to bring the souls of daemons into these to good effect, including the soul of his ancestor, Mercury. In the same way, they used to make the souls of Phoebus, Isis, and Osiris descend into statues, to be for men's use or even to be harmful to men (1980, 127).

This quotation demonstrates the complexity of Ficino's world-view, in that he incorporates ideas from Greek and Egyptian traditions into his ideas of natural philosophy, and the order of the universe. And although Christianity is not mentioned specifically in this passage, since Ficino was a monk, one can only assume that the Christian ideas about the cosmos also figured prominently in Ficino's philosophy[37]. Kristeller and Mebane also note that the large role astrology played in Ficino's view of the world cannot be easily overlooked, especially as it is common knowledge that Ficino had large astrological figures painted on the walls of his study, framed by the aspects of a laughing Democritus and a weeping Heraclitus. These two figures encapsulate much of Ficino's occultist teachings: Democritus representing the joy of earthly lives, while Heraclitus represents the potential misery of that existence[38].

Pico was a student and friend of Ficino, and took his ideas and built upon them[39]. Pico's eclectic education was quite impressive, especially in the field of languages; he of course spoke Latin, but also very good Greek, as well as Hebrew and Arabic with varying degrees of proficiency. His ability to read

Hebrew was one of his defining characteristics, as it introduced him to Cabbalist texts which had previously gone unexplored by the occultist writers of his day. Pico built upon the occultist tradition established by Ficino, but added the writings of the Cabbala to the mixture, and felt that this addition would give him a powerful new tool with which to effect the magic he wanted. One of the reasons for the Cabbala's strong influence on Pico and his successors was the new ways the Cabbala gave him of interpreting familiar texts, as Copenhaver and Schmitt summarise when they say that the "Cabbala taught Pico that every feature of the Torah is meaningful and that special hermeneutic devices (such as gematria, a way of interpreting Hebrew words according to the numerical value of their letters) can penetrate its secrets" (1992, 168).

One of Pico's most famous works is his *Heptaplus*, in which he explicates the writings of Moses, and specifically, of the creation of the world; this work is also (in)famous because it was declared heretical by the Vatican's censors. It is, however, useful to look at this work as an example of the different ways Pico brought into looking at long-familiar texts. He argues in his writings that

> (I)f, after the words are taken apart, we take separately the same letters, and, according to the rules which Hebrews hand down, we join them together correctly into expressions that can be make with them; they say that, if we are capable of hidden wisdom, very wise and marvelous dogmas about many things will shine out to us. If this is done with the whole law, then finally, there will be brought to light, by both the correct position and connection of elements, every doctrine and the secrets of all the liberal disciplines (1977, 111).

This segment of Pico's writing shows that he was indeed involved in a Cabbalistic interpretation of text, and his friendship with Ficino argues in favour of a strongly Christian, as well as classical Greek and Egyptian, construction of the universe. Pico was widely known throughout Europe. His international repuation was achieved largely through the biography written by his nephew, as well as because of the furor created by Pico's new theories and methods of reading the Bible[40]. The Church frowned upon the methods used by Pico in his writing and interpretations, ensuring his infamy throughout Europe.

Both Ficino and Pico were highly influential in re-animating a magical tradition which had stagnated under the medieval Scholastic tradition. There were a number of important medieval magi, such as Roger Bacon and Albertus Magnus, but Ficino and Pico took the tradition which they inherited in a radically new direction. *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, however, is completely oblivious to this new tradition and the new hermeneutic devices used by contemporary magi. In Greene's play, the character of Bacon is highly educated, but Greene consistently depicts this knowledge as illegitimate and beyond the realm of righteous human capabilities. In his play, Greene ignores the academic tradition; for example, he mentions "Cabbala" in only two lines of the play (ii,106 and ix, 28); both references appear in peripheral functions and Greene does not once speak of astrological concerns and influences. This unconcern with the academic tradition of the occult shows that for Greene, as for his contemporaries, magic was a matter completely controlled by spirits, or demons: he shows little concern in differentiating between the various avenues open to learned magi.

Ficino and Pico gathered many disciples to their writings, and perhaps the best-known of these is Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535), a German scholar with a gift for languages and a passion for the occult. In their studies of the Renaissance occult tradition, both Frances A. Yates and John Mebane agree that he can be regarded as a follower of the teachings of Ficino and Pico, but that he takes their studies in a completely different direction than the one they likely intended. Mebane states that "(t)he Hermetic/Cabbalist magic which Pico and Ficino formulated was popularised in northern Europe ... largely through Cornelius Agrippa's *De Occulta (Philosophia)*" (1989, 53). Despite owing many of his ideas to his Itlaian precursors, Agrippa shows little of the piety demonstrated by Pico in his use of the Cabbala, or if Agrippa does advocate piety in the Cabbalistic practitioner, it is likely to be preceded or followed by a description of the powers awaiting the person who can master the secret of the Hebrew texts.

In Agrippa's work on the occult, which has been translated into German under the general title of *Magische Werke*[41], he notes that religion should be used piously, but that it should nevertheless be used to further the aims of the magus. He states in the first volume of his *Magische Werke* that

> Die Zauberformeln oder Gesänge sollen eine so große Macht besitzen, daß man glaubt, sie können beinahe die ganze Natur umkehren, wie Apuleius sagt, daß durch das magische Gemurmel rasche Ströme in ihrem Laufe rückwärts gelenkt, das

> Meer gefesselt, die Winde besänftigt, die Sonne fest halten, (usw)... (1921, Band 1: 335-36)

This passage, although in the conjunctive voice, shows us clearly that Agrippa's notion of magic does not revolve so much around knowledge as around power, and awareness of the secrets of the universe is only used to increase one's personal standing within the world. Because of the conjunctive tone of this passage, Agrippa suggests to the reader the potential of magic, even more than he shows what can actually be accomplished. The reference to Apuleius also indicates Agrippa's indebtedness to his classical learning, and the teachings of the ancients.

In his article on white and black magic, particularly in the case of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Towne notes that Agrippa argues in favour of the intervention of good spirits on behalf of the magus in controlling the infernal spirits. Agrippa's argument is a step backward for the magi of the early modern period, because Ficino and Pico were members of the Neoplatonic school of magic, which argued for a "natural magic", that is, preternatural acts performed without the intervention of spirits. Agrippa's writings moved magic back towards the medieval tradition, in which Neoaristotelean magic was practiced, which stated that all magic was governed by spirits either infernal or divine (Russell 1980, 73).

The teachings of Agrippa played right into the hands of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. Throughout this era there was a conscious confusion of magic and witchcraft by the religious authorities, especially as each side of the religious/theological battles accused the other of being in league with the Devil. Because of the religious conflict raging across Europe, the accusations of witchcraft and collusion with the Devil were also pan-European. Although Bacon does not make a specific pact with the Devil in this play, he is depicted throughout as being in league with the Devil. For example, in the magicians' duel between Bacon and Vandermast, the spirit of Hercules refuses to obey Vandermast, stating: "Seest thou not great Bacon here,/ Whose frown doth act more than thy magic can? ... Bacon, that bridles headstrong Belcephon,/ And rules Asmenoth, guider of the north,/ Binds me from yielding unto Vandermast" (ix, 136-37, 141-43). This statement clearly grants Bacon powers beyond the acceptable scope of humankind, as he not only collaborates with the Devils, but even rules over them almost as a great demon himself; Greene makes it obvious that Bacon has made a pact with the Devil to gain his powers[42]. As Jeffrey B. Russell points out, the "idea of the pact was crucial, because it put the cap on the demonization of the sorcerer" (1980, 55). He goes on to state that the inquisitors of this era began to regard pacts as being either "explicit or implicit. No document needed to be signed or official promise given: the mere act of summoning demons constituted an implied pact and rendered the accused subject to prosecution for heresy" (1980, 77). By this definition, Bacon's character in Greene's play is surely guilty of heresy and collaboration with the Devil.

In contrast to Bacon's implicit pact, Tyche makes it obvious that she has signed her life away to the Devil, and has made an explicit pact, at the cost of her soul, to gain her powers. She says to Celinde,

> "Die (geister) forderten von dem ein ungebohren kind,
> Von dem die mutter selbst; der musst als taub und blind
> Auff einer wegscheid ihm die keusche tochter schlachten.
> ...Man hat des knaben haupt umdrehend abgerissen,
> Aus welchem nachmals sich die geister hören ließen" (II, 191-202).

This statement, along with others of its ilk, make Tyche a completely unredeemable character, and worthy of the witch-hunts of her era[43]. Bacon's character is necessarily not painted as blackly as Tyche is, because in that case, no one in the audience would be pleased at his redemption. Tyche does not change her character, and the audience can only assume, in a play where God is overwhelmingly present, that she will meet her deserved end at some point in the future. Gryphius' attitude towards witchcraft in this play goes far towards explaining the witch-hunts of the Seventeenth Century, and the distrust of occult activities of contemporary German society, but Gryphius himself did not have, from a modern point of view, a clear-cut animosity towards all things occult.

The figure of Tyche is an interesting one; I cannot imagine a more clichéd version of a witch, and she herself reveals all the evil things witches supposedly perpetrated throughout history. In a long passage in the second act, Tyche details many of the atrocities which she has perpetrated to gain her diabolical powers. She freely admits that

> Kein fleisch, kein geweide
> Der kälber war genug, kein hirsch in wilder heide
> Von hunden auffgejagt, kein unberührter stier,
> Kein auffgewachsen hengst, kein unvernünfftig thier.
> Die geister, die die welt die not geheimnis lehren,
> Muss man mit reinem blut erkiester menschen ehren.
> ... Man hat des knaben haupt umdrehend abgerissen,
> Aus welchem nachmals sich die geister hören ließen.
> Man hieb mit ertz von dem, von jenem cörper ab,
> Was zu dem opffer dient; man stanckert in dem grab
> Nach einer schwangern faust; man zog den dürren leichen
> Die feuchte leinwand aus ... (II, 185-206)

This quotation is but a sample of the horrifying deeds to which Tyche openly acknowledges, and the fact that a character on stage could even utter such lines is a strong indication of the fear with which German society of the mid-seventeenth century still regarded witches; these servants of the Devil continued to be, at least in the minds of their contemporaries, responsible for many of the most despicable things imaginable to humankind[44] .

Gryphius' presentation of Tyche's character is especially interesting in the light of the fact that the era of witch trials and inquisitions was coming to an end: the last of the major witch trials in Germany occurred in the 1630's, and the number of minor trials trailed off quickly in the latter half of the seventeenth century[45]. Gryphius seems convinced that witches still posed a threat to society, and was bent on warning his fellow humans of the dangers witchcraft posed to their persons and their souls. But where exactly was the line drawn between good and bad forms of supra-human knowledge? This play touches on the subject of acceptable levels of occult knowledge very subtly, in showing how Tyche and Olympia both try to find supernaturally-hidden messages, and why one sins while the other demonstrates her virtue; this topic will be explored more fully in the second chapter of this argument.

While in Leiden, Gryphius taught a course on chiromancy, which he must have considered to be a legitimate activity. He was a pious and staunch Lutheran, and eschewed any sort of activity which would have tainted his character, so this must mean that he considered that particular subject to be not only acceptable, but also salutary in helping people to understand God's will regarding their fates and destinies. In his day, the mixture of what we now consider to be science and the occult was blurred. Gryphius proved his familiarity with new scientific ideas by arguing that fire is not an element, but seemed to contradict this modern stance by teaching about palmistry. According to Powell, for Gryphius, "as for many of his European contemporaries, there were two kinds of truth—one of faith or religion, the other of reason or science" (xi-xii). This dichotomy is merely one example of the differences between our era and Gryphius', that which in our present age would be considered a contradiction of science and religion was then regarded as normal.

Within the play *Cardenio und Celinde*, Gryphius uses elements of this tradition in very divergent ways, and adds many elements of his own, which bear little resemblance to the high-brow, academic tradition in which magi like Ficino, Pico or Agrippa wrote; these elements are namely the appearances of ghosts and angels within the play. These spirits are not unique to Gryphius and figure prominently in Christian literature from the Bible right through the

Middle Ages. These agents play, within the drama, an active role in shaping human lives and destinies in accordance with divine wishes. These spirits are subject to God, rather than the magus or witch, and serve as messengers from God as He directs the characters' lives back onto their destined paths.

Among the less overtly occult elements of this play, and unlike Greene, there is a definite astrological and astronomical presence within this drama, as will be discussed later, and which is part of the sphere of academic writings produced by the magi. In contrast to this scholarly tradition with which Gryphius demonstrates himself to be at least moderately familiar, he creates the figure of Tyche to be the representation of all that is evil about magic and to warn the audience of the danger which magic could pose to them.

Unlike Tyche, whose character is obviously evil, the figure of Roger Bacon is a problematical one in Greene's play — on the one hand, he is a friar who seems to help Prince Edward attempt to procure a concubine (vi) and contributes to the deaths of two young Oxford men and their fathers (xiii); conversely, he is concerned with England's well-being and international reputation, and a jolly figure who strives to use his powers benevolently. Greene's play does not question the intent of the friendly friar, but calls into serious doubt the source of Bacon's powers, and the cost which must be paid to the demons from whom his art is derived.

In this play, Greene depicts Bacon as a benevolent magus who has been led astray, and who is toying with powers far greater than the ones he legitimately receives on Earth. The friar, despite being a man of God, serves as a warning of the dangers of learning; he sets a dangerous example for the people around him, and threatens to mislead his followers. It is the conflict between these two directions, heaven and hell, which makes Bacon such a difficult figure to classify casually as purely good or evil. But the same features which make him difficult to categorise also make him a good instructional figure for the audience: they are forced to recognise the contrast between the intent behind Bacon's actions and the effects he achieves in their execution. By noting the discrepancy between intent and effect, the audience is forced to realise the hazards of toying themselves with magic.

Another charge against Bacon's character is not as easy to deflect: many critics charge that Bacon's character desires only personal glory, and has too much pride in himself and his accomplishments (Assarsson-Rizzi 1972, 69). Bacon is, therefore, willing to use illegitimate means to acquire magical powers and the fame which accompanies them. He is a figure within the larger competition for honour which exists amongst the monarchs in the play when he is required to better Vandermast's magical exploits. Bacon does so quite willingly, but with the acknowledgment that Vandermast's abilities are far beneath his own; Bacon refuses to debate "unless he be more learn'd than Vandermast" (ix, 129). These lines demonstrate Bacon's awareness of his own talents, while also serving as a subtle reflection of the fact that Bacon seeks to perform only those tasks which will bring him glory.

The friar does not wish to debate with Vandermast for his own sake, because Bacon regards Vandermast's capacities to be far beneath his own.

Like Prince Hal defeating Hotspur in Shakespeare's *Henry IV, Part 1*, Bacon wishes to do battle with, and defeat, an opponent better than himself, so that all of his opponent's glory comes to rest upon his own shoulders[46]. In this play, Bacon only agrees to Vandermast's challenge at the prompting of King Henry, who wishes Bacon to defend the honour of English universities and scholars. Bacon's submission to Henry's demand shows that Bacon still has respect for earthly hierarchies, and recognises Henry's God-given right to rule England and its subjects. Greene's concern with the proper order of things shows that he promoted a recognition of the propriety of social hierarchy, and encouraged people to know their own place. Greene consistently defended earthly hierarchies in his plays and prose, and may have deliberately created Bacon as an egomaniacal character to show the danger of education (Crupi 1986, 3-4). This attitude would make Greene's play almost religious, if one uses the Marxist maxim of religion being an "opiate of the masses". The play encourages the theatre-going public not to question their social standing, but simply to accept life as it is offered to them.

Throughout this play, Greene depicts magic in its most clichéd form, with the use of spirits to achieve the effects desired by the magi Bacon, Bungay and Vandermast. Bacon attempts to use his power for the good of the people around him, but it becomes apparent through the course of the play that his attempts are all in vain because he is using illegitimate means in his efforts. Most of the population of Europe at this time was morbidly afraid of witches and warlocks, and their power to work evil, and Greene may well have been seeking to capitalise on this terror[47]. As Copenhaver and Schmitt note, "the prevailing outlook in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries was gloomier (than the enlightened court of Rudolf II)... Dee died in 1608 with the reputation of a wizard; and Bruno went to the stake in 1600, condemned for heresy" (1992, 54). Greene may not personally have felt that magic was inherently evil, but he certainly knew that a large portion of the theatre-going public were frightened of things occult, and so he played on the popular biases against witches for his own profit; Seltzer notes that "to judge from Henslowe's receipts[48], the play was a definite success" (x), and was reprinted in a quarto edition in 1630, further proof of its continuing approval by audiences, who in all likelihood had almost no knowledge of the academic tradition behind the European magi. In his *History of Witchcraft*, Russell notes that the distinction between the witch and the magus "was generally lost on public opinion" (1980, 73), and as Greene's play demonstrates, the drama of the period often played on these fears to enhance their popular appeal.

Greene uses a "black" word to display the evil nature of Bacon's art: he calls Bacon's magic by the word "nigromancy" to demonstrate Bacon's erring ways, and thereby highlighting his need for repentance. Throughout the play, Bacon is described as a "nigromancer"; Greene only uses the variation "necro-" or "nicromancy" to describe the art of what Vandermast and Bungay practice. The Oxford English Dictionary defines necromancy as: "the pretended art of revealing future events, etc., by means of communication with the dead; more generally, magic enchantment, conjuration." The dictionary goes on to state that "nigromancy" is a derivative form of "necromancy", and makes no distinction between the two. I find it significant that "nigro" carries the connotation of blackness to it, and hence would more likely to be associated with black magic. Throughout this play, Friar Bacon is associated with the darker side of magic and the spiritual world. Bacon makes constant reference to the spirits with whom he commiserates, and specifies his powers over perdition when he states that, "Hell trembled at my deep, commanding spells" (xi, 109). This quotation clearly shows that Bacon uses dark powers and enchantments to gain his own strength, and Greene goes on to show, through the figure of Miles, the dangers of associating with such spirits, as will be shown later in this discussion.

On a superficial level, both of these plays deal with the occult, and the dangers associated therewith. While Greene has Friar Bacon, representing the most potent magus in his play, use spirits directly to gain his desires, Gryphius uses spirits as agents of God in turning Cardenio and Celinde back onto the path of righteousness. Bacon comes to realise his error by his own powers of reason, which he then ceases to use, or only uses these powers for the good of the country, rather than for the self-glorification which had previously been his wont. Greene likely recognised that matters of the occult were entertaining, and therefore profitable, and in all likelihood wrote his play more in an effort to make money that for any great and burning desire he felt to keep the Lord's flock on the "straight and narrow". By condemning magic in the play, however, Greene manages to titillate both his audience's desire for entertainment, as well as keeping himself in the good graces of the more religious elements of society. Gryphius, on the other hand, was a part of the "more religious elements of society". He was a staunch Lutheran who specifically chose his witch Tyche to show his audience the dangers of occult knowledge, while using Celinde and Cardenio to prove that God watches out for all humans on this earth, regardless of the severity of their (attempted) sin. Gryphius makes patently clear in his play that the occult is to be shunned at the very peril of one's soul, but then, in contradiction of all both he and Greene had made clear in their plays, each of them leaves some element of doubt in the audience's minds about how far each of these authors is willing to tolerate, and maybe even encourage, occult knowledge.

Chapter 2: Ambiguous Stances by the Role Models in Gryphius' and Greene's Plays

Drama was a medium which could be used as a means of teaching the general population during Europe's early modern period. There were, naturally, huge differences between what was "general" in Germany and Greene's England; where Gryphius' audiences were likely the upper middle classes who could afford to send their sons to the academy[1], Greene's audience likely ran the full gamut of English society of the time, from common labourers to members of the aristocracy. While theatre was more notably overtly didactic in the continental drama written and performed by the Jesuits, the popular English drama of the period was also designed to teach the audience about right and wrong and the current events of the rest of Europe. Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* is a play designed to warn against the Devil and human pride, Ben Jonson warned his audiences about the foolishness of being gulled by those same "occultists" in his play, *The Alchemist*, and Gryphius echoed the horrified continental reaction to England's regicide in his play, *Carolus Stuardus*. These plays present stories important to their time in a manner which is more easily understood by their audiences than a dry lecture or sermon on the same topic, but were not always an exact copy of the ecclesiastical attitudes of the day. As noted earlier, Marlowe's play is not a strict condemnation of the Faust character, but rather, the author's struggle with the constantly shifting ideas of right and wrong of that unstable era.

The plays by Greene and Gryphius are not quite as subtle as those by Marlowe or other English playwrights, but do yield to the careful reader many fascinating insights into the attitudes of the day. Both of these authors have a strong suspicion of learning, despite the fact that both of them were very well educated, and they were both wary of the hubris which could accompany book-knowledge. Excessive pride in one's learning could lead the student to think that he or she had no further need of God, and was capable of controlling her or his own destiny. The figures of Roger Bacon, Friar Bungay, Jacques Vandermast and Miles in Greene's play, and Celinde, Cardenio and the witch Tyche in Gryphius' play all show the dangers of playing with powers beyond human comprehension. Miles goes to hell, and Tyche almost surely goes there as well, although this damnation would only exist outside of the action of the play. Friar Bacon is the only one of these characters who realises his mistake within the play's plot, and is able to repent before it is too late to save his own soul. Tyche attempts to mislead Celinde onto the same path the witch follows, but Celinde is saved through divine intervention and re-converted to a simple faith in God. Olympia maintains such an uncomplicated belief throughout the play, although with an intriguing lapse that will be explored later in this discussion.

The didactic capabilities are one of the joys of the dramatic genre; when performed as the plays are intended, they provide a means of effecting and confirming public morality. Unlike novels, which can be read and considered in private, drama is most often a direct reflection of a society's mores: the people, within the theatre at least, are almost forced to acquiesce to the prevailing consensus of the day. As Kenneth Krauss notes in his book on the relationship between playwright and audience, "the very nature of the theatre experience, which transpires between those working on stage and those watching in the house, is made accessible to readers only when they look at a playscript with an awareness of the requisite presence of the audience" (1993, 16). This quotation lends credence to my ideal that plays are designed to be an interaction between playwright, performers and audience. In Greene's and Gryphius' plays, we cannot speculate on the performers' interpretation of the plays themselves, having no description of the events, but we do know enough about both the authors and the era to speculate on what transpired between playwright and audience.

In Greene's play, there is no discernable effort made to connect logically and seamlessly all the various plot threads, but rather the play is a series of events which transpire around the figure of Roger Bacon. He serves as a reflection of the larger action of the play, which can be described as a romance in its structure and content (Assarsson-Rizzi 1972, 79), namely, the play is full of magic and love, which any reader of the *Don Quixote* will recognise as the stuff of romance, and the problems which Bacon must resolve through his magic reflect the larger problems which must be solved by the lovers in the play. Bacon is the central character in the play simply because the threads of his story interweave with and reflect the action in the main plot which concerns the joining of the young lovers; as a character in a romance, Bacon is perfectly at home: he is a sorcerer who has preternatural powers, which he, for the most part, seeks to use benevolently.

It is Bacon's ability to affect those around him which becomes more and more important as the play progresses, and almost all of his magical efforts directly or indirectly lead to some manner of disaster, as will be discussed later. One obvious charge against Bacon would be the fact that he sets his simple subsizar, Miles, on the road to hell. Bacon's servant is not intelligent enough to realise the danger of Bacon's actions, and in the entire episode with the brass head (xi). Even before leaving Miles in charge, Bacon admits that he has

> ... fram'd out a monstrous head of brass,
> That, by th' enchanting forces of the devil,
> Shall tell out strange and uncouth aphorisms" (xi, 18-20).

But Miles is oblivious to any such admissions, and treats the head with contempt, despite its obviously diabolical nature. Miles hits the head, saying that "time was when my master was a wise man, but that was before he began to make the brazen head. You shall lie, while your arse ache and your head speak no better (68-71). These quotations demonstrate that Miles is ignorant of Bacon's art, and lacks the fear which a good Christian should have at hearing the Devil's name, similarly to the character of Cristoph Wagner in the Faust legend, to use the rough German equivalent.

Miles is the unrepentant figure in the play, and is made unsympathetic throughout the story, through his constant complaints of the scholar's lifestyle and his snide remarks at his fellow-characters on stage; for these reasons the audience need not be disturbed by his fate. Miles is shown to be a stupid lout, and even Bacon curses his own servant when he says, "Why, thou arrant dunce, shall I never make thee a good scholar? Does not all the town cry out and say, Friar Bacon's subsizar is the greatest blockhead in all Oxford?" (v, 24-26). This statement shows Bacon's low regard for his servant, and the master's ability to lead his foolish servant astray and off the path of pious obedience to God; Miles is not intelligent enough to recognise the danger of the powers used by Bacon, and is therefore more susceptible to being misled.

The audience is reminded, thorugh the figure of Miles, that although Bacon repents at the end of the play, not all people will have his awareness and feel the same need for repentance. Miles is an earthy figure who is concerned with the body and who cares little for the mind and soul, so when he sees the wondrous feats achieved by Bacon through his use of nigromantic powers, Miles seeks to emulate Bacon's feats to satisfy his desires, which are mostly concerned with his physical comfort[2]. A demon is more than happy to give Miles a ride to hell on his back, where all he wants is "a lusty fire there, a pot of good ale, a pair of cards, a swinging piece of chalk, and a brown toast that will clap a white waistcoat on a cup of good drink" (xv, 34-37). This line demonstrates Miles' poor spiritual life, and the fact that he cares not for God and his fellow-man. Greene is thus able to send someone to hell and remind his audience of the (perceived) very real dangers of going to hell, but he sends someone for whom the audience has little sympathy, and at whose departure and damnation they need not be overly distraught. In this way, Greene achieves the two ends he sets forth for his play, namely, the desire to entertain and educate the audience; their entertainment is not disturbed by damning Bacon, which would turn the play into a tragedy, but Miles nonetheless teaches them of the danger of disregarding their souls.

Like Greene, Gryphius sets out a clear dichotomy between the forces of good and evil, and the need for repentance. The figure who represents evil in this play is Tyche, and like Miles, the audience is made to feel relief that she will surely be damned for her transgressions against both God and humanity. Although she is not damned within the action of the play, her crimes are of such a magnitude, as has been noted elsewhere, that there would be no doubt in the minds of the audience that she will be sent to hell. As she herself admits, one can seek the advice of "seelen, in der luft ... / Der abgrund wird durchforscht; mit segnen und mit fluchen / Riss man das ehrne thor der tiefsten höllen auf" (II, 177-179). With the strong reference to hell, this statement, among many others, proves that Tyche is a servant of the Devil. If she were to win the soul of Celinde, then the Devil would win the battle for Celinde's soul: this series of actions would mean that God is less than omnipotent, and therefore subject to both Fortuna and the Devil. According to mainstream Christian theology[3], this line of reasoning is impossible and Gryphius surely would not have sanctioned it[4]. Best argues (1991, 68) that Tyche's presence shows that God uses Tyche to fulfill His wishes, but I think that God subverts the attempts of the Devil and saves the souls of both Celinde and Cardenio. There is no hint that God's will lies behind Tyche's actions, but there is evidence of divine intervention in the crypt, in which the spirit of Marcellus appears to frighten Celinde onto the path of righteousness, and to make that path clear to her through preternatural means.

Both Tyche and Miles are figures needed to remind us of the failings of humankind, and the need for a faith in God. They represent a very distinct proof that the dangers of witchcraft were regarded as real, and that the plays themselves were designed to educate the audiences against the temptation to try to rise above their lot in life. Drama took on a life of its own, and sought to fulfill the Horatian ideal of both pleasing and educating their audience. Each play presents an aspect of occult knowledge, and the dangers associated with it. Greene's play focuses on the human desire to control supernatural spirits, and although Bacon, through the grace of God, repents (xiii, 85-108), Miles reminds the audience that any such activity carries eternal consequences (xvi). Like Miles, the figure of Tyche in Gryphius' play is a character who is a reminder to the audience that witches do exist (Act II), and that they must be shunned at all costs. This suggests to me that Gryphius favoured the witch-hunts of the seventeenth century, but it is far too speculative an idea to be dealt with thoroughly in this thesis.

Some readers of Greene's play might come to the conclusion that Greene's depiction of Roger Bacon is a true historical depiction of Bacon's use of magic; I think that this objection is both inaccurate and irrelevant. Greene uses Bacon's reputation to instruct Renaissance theatre-goers on the perceived dangers of practicing magic; as noted earlier, the play is supposed to entertain and instruct, and the instruction could only be aimed at contemporary and/or future viewers. It makes no sense for Greene to warn his audience of dangers he, or the religious authorities of the day, did not feel were real. As noted by Russell, the first witchcraft laws in Tudor England were passed in 1542 and were repealed in 1547. Under Elizabeth's reign, laws were enacted in 1563 which set the tone until James' reign. These laws prescribed the death penalty for "witches, enchanters, and sorcerers" (1980, 92). The main difference between English laws and Continental laws was that England's statutes were secular rather than ecclesiastical, and so it was easier for England to avoid the witch panics that swept the Continent, fueled largely through charges of heresy.

Although not heretics in England, witches were still perceived as a threat. Greene must have felt that the spiritual magic depicted in the play was the reality of his day, and that the stereotypes used must have been how the Elizabethan public conceived of magi. Greene did not know, or did not care, about the intellectual reality of the magi, but rather was concerned with the perceived danger of magic, which was all considered to be "black" and dangerous; Bacon's magic was thought by critics such as Towne to be extremely harmful[5]. Greene warned his audience of the danger they wished to hear about, but which bore little relation to the world-view of the Renaissance magi. Bacon merely represents a figure who has a desire to control the physical universe in which he lived.

Like Greene's figure Bacon, Gryphius depicts this attitude as an all-too-human failing, and one to which extreme emotions can drive a person, as in the case of Celinde in his play. She is a rather normal woman who is just trying to survive in harsh times, and falls immoderately in love with Cardenio, or, as Gryphius in his "Vorrede" describes it: "eine rasende, tolle und verzweiflende (Liebe)" (1961, 264). Her desire to force Cardenio to feel the same desperate passion towards her leads her to undertake an action which is an abomination to both God and Man, namely, necromancy. Marcellus' ghost forces Celinde to realise that what she is doing is truly wrong, and she refuses to allow herself to be led any further by her desire to control her own fortunes, as Tyche tries to bring her to do.

Both Friar Bacon and Celinde commit a sin according to their respective societies' ideas of hubris and crimes against God. Each of these characters seeks to control the world around him/her, and is unwilling to accept God's dominion over both this world as well as the next. Both authors depict these actions as unacceptable in their plays, and with the public nature of the theatre event, these plays provide substantive evidence that John Guy is correct when he argues that even the most debauched members of Renaissance society could not truly conceive of a world in which God did not play a deciding role (1990, 414). Both of these characters attempt to live their lives as if God does not exist, or in open defiance of God, but come to their senses in the end: Celinde through divine intervention, and Bacon through a realisation of his mistakes.

Throughout the play, Bacon's magical tools all lead to some manner of disaster—even his prospective glass, which seems to be a harmless contraption. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a "prospective glass" can mean either a magical glass, or simply a telescope. The fact that there is only one word for the two devices, one magical and the other scientific, indicates that there was little differentiation between the two instruments at the time. By using the telescope in his play, Greene again criticises learning and aspiring beyond our natural abilities. I think that it is worth speculating at this point that there was a great antipathy towards both education and mechanical advances during the Elizabethan era, at least within a statistically significant portion of society; if one looks at a play like *Friar Bacon*, or Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus*, one can detect a great distrust of institutions of higher learning. While attempting to fashion a bronze head for his college at Oxford Bacon "dived into hell / and sought the darkest palaces of fiends; / That with my magic spells great Belcephon / Hath left his lodge and kneeled at my cell" (xi, 7-10). Similarly, when Faustus doubts his decision to sign away his soul, the Devil appeases him by saying, "(P)eruse this book and view it thoroughly, and thou shalt turn thyself into whatever shape thou wilt" (II, ii, 182-184). Each of these examples show that magic and the Devil go hand-in-hand; Bacon actually plumbs the depths of hell to get what he desires, while Faustus has the Devil bring forbidden knowledge right to him. Both of these characters are closely tied with the universities in their respective stories, and neither is content with the knowledge that they have thus far acquired. Greene and Marlowe each use their magical characters to warn their audiences about the dangers of knowing, and wanting to know, too much.

The Faustus figure goes out of his way to court the Devil in the attempt to know everything in the universe, even if only for a limited time[6], while Friar Bacon uses a "magical" device, the prospective glass, in a bid to help people, but in the end, only brings pain and loss to two families. His prospective glass, that confluence of magical lore and modern science, brings about the deaths of both the junior and senior Lamberts and Serlsbys, albeit indirectly. If he had not prevented the marriage of Lacy and Margaret by espying them through the glass, the fathers of the scholars would have had no cause to fight, and neither they nor their sons, who witness the duel through the glass, would have killed one another. So the prospective glass brings a world of woe to two families, and all because Friar Bacon sought to know and show more than he ought.

The parallel figure in Gryphius' play, Tyche, fulfills a similar role to Bacon's, as a warning against the villainy of magic, and, like a medieval morality play, wears her character in her name. Tyche's name itself is very significant due to Gryphius' highly imaginative use of language; her name, while being the Greek word for "fortune", is also a homonym for the German word "Tücke", meaning "malice or spite" (Terrell, et al., 1990, 663)[7]. The name also can refer to the Greek goddess, Fortuna, and the role she plays in the affairs of humankind. In Greek mythology, even the gods were subject to the caprices of Fortuna, but in Gryphius' Christian cosmology, any such suggestion would be blasphemous. Gryphius remained firmly within the Christian tradition, in which a literary figure such as Dante placed Fortuna below Providence, as did Jacob Bidermann, the German Jesuit dramatist of the generation preceding Gryphius', so Gryphius keeps within his own literary, as well as cultural, tradition by making Fortuna subject to the will of God.

Both Tyche and Bacon are the characters who are supposed to instruct the audience. If Bacon and Celinde represent a pair who represent human potential for divine grace and mercy, then Bacon, together with Miles, and Tyche are the figures in these two plays who remind the audience of the reality of spiritual magic, and the need to shun all contact with it. The characters who dabble in magic and things of the occult would be there to instruct the audience of the need for a simple faith in God, and to avoid the hubris of education which could lead them away from this uncomplicated faith. As Luther is so widely quoted as saying to his second-in-command, Philip Melanchton, "Sin boldly, and trust in God even more boldly." This statement shows the religious ideal for which Gryphius strove. Although he chided his audience not to sin in the first place, he did endorse such an uncomplicated faith in God's grace, and His willingness to save any and all of His children, as in the case of Celinde, where she was saved while in the unnatural act of raiding a tomb.

In Greene's personal history, he may well have regarded education as leading to a dissatisfaction with life and encouraged his audience not to follow in his footsteps. Or, he might have just thought that these were the ideas which his audience would want to hear. Regardless, the figure of the friar is that of a teacher, but as Bacon's character shows in this play, education can lead to an over-weening pride which is willing to use illicit means to advance one's knowledge, even to the point of using diabolical, spiritual magic. Greene makes the character of Bacon suitably in need of reform in the first portion of the play to give Bacon's repentance an air of legitimacy at the end. Greene paints his title character as prideful and ambitious; Bacon displays pride in the disdain he shows towards Vandermast (ix, 129) and ambition in his plan to create a magical bronze head and use it to ring England in a defensive wall of brass (xi, 20). Both of these characteristics push him towards magic and its religious pitfalls.

This attitude towards learning seems rather puritanical, because the Puritans often decried things which they deemed unnatural. They felt that any mechanical inventions which impinged upon God's power, in this case the ability to see across vast distances, were the work of the Devil. As I. Bernard Cohen notes in his article, "many Puritan writings expressed an anti-intellectualism which could be construed as inimical to science" (1990, 3). This quotation echoes the uncertainty of both science and religion of that day, and one which has made its way even into the twentieth century. It is interesting that Greene would choose to use the prospective glass as an example of heresy and danger in his play. The fact that he does condemn mechanical manipulations as prideful is indicative of the feelings of Elizabethan England, and as noted above, the existence of two figures such as Friar Bacon and Dr. Faustus expresses a concern both with universities and knowledge, and with the limits which should be placed upon humankind's ambitions. Greene's play, and the attitudes depicted therein, are consistent with this concern about education.

This increase in the general level of education may well have led some members of the society to fear that God's place would be lost in this world, and that humanity would cease to trust in Him, preferring to trust in themselves and their own powers. By believing in a witch and her powers, Celinde allows herself to trust in Fortuna, which is a sign of giving oneself over to vanitas and the cares of this world, as well as believing that human beings can learn enough about the spirits of the universe to control God, or at least to circumvent His designs. Celinde endures great emotional and psychological trauma as she undergoes the tests of her love, because she does not realise that her passion is too strong and that it leads her away from God. She is forced by Tyche to go into Marcellus' crypt and retrieve "dessen (Marcellus) hertz zu diesem vorsatz haben / Das ich zu rechter zeit vorhin mit ihrem blut / Um etwas angefrischt, wolt auf geweyhter gluth / Verbrennen gantz zu asch" (II, 138-141). By removing the heart from the corpse of her dead lover, Celinde would commit an action which is counter to all the laws of God and Man. For the sake of her love for Cardenio, Celinde undertakes the task, but is fortuitously interrupted by the spirit of Marcellus which appears to her in the church, preventing her from going too far down the path of the damned. The appearance of Marcellus' ghost is an example of divine intervention, in which God makes His will known to Celinde, and is therefore theologically and morally sound, proving that God is indeed involved in the daily activities of this world. By repenting and trusting in

God, Celinde is no longer trying to usurp power from God as she was when she believed in Tyche and her unnatural means of controlling destiny, but rather, Celinde realises her mistake, and puts her faith in God, never to be tempted to depravity again (or so the play ends). She declares: "Fahr hin, verfälschte lust! Fahrt hin, nicht reine flammen! / Ihr vorbild höllischer gluth! Celinde wil verdammen, / Was ihr verdammen würckt. Celinde wil allein / Von dieser stund an gott ein reines opfer seyn" (V, 349-52).

Gryphius' play is, through its instruction of the audience on the true and proper nature of faith, didactic in its intent and execution. This concern for edification is shown by the venue in which his plays were first performed and for which they were written: one of the two academies in Breslau. These academies produced a variety of German playwrights, and seem to have been the hot-bed of German dramatic production at this time; in addition to Gryphius' contributions, plays were later produced there which were written by Daniel Caspar von Lohenstein and Johann Christian Hallmann, two of the most highly-respected German playwrights of the latter half of the seventeenth century. All three of these playwrights were educated in the type of academies where their plays were later staged, and would have been familiar with the two directions in which academic thought of the day was going, namely, the struggle to reconcile religious with scientific truth, all the while attempting to maintain a pious faith in God.

In Greene's play, Bacon represents a figure struggling to reconcile piety with knowledge, an enterprise which seems common to the day, with figures like Ficino and Pico struggling to harmonise their Christian religion with their occultist beliefs. Greene is unconcerned with the intellectual reality of the battles undertaken by these magi; his primary motivation is to instruct his audience of the perceived dangers of magic, and is indifferent towards the natural magic practiced by many of the Renaissance magi. Both Bacon and Prince Edward are figures of redemption in this play, and each must overcome his desire for personal power. Edward seeks to use Bacon as a tool to extend his power over chaste Margaret (xi), while Bacon attempts to use spirits as a tool to enlarge his capacity to solve the mysteries of the universe (ix, xi). So like much of human interaction, this play is driven by an exploration of the issues surrounding power and its proper use. Edward is able to overcome his personal desires (xvi), and to put the good of the country above his own wishes; likewise Bacon must overcome his personal desire for grandeur and content himself with worrying about his immortal soul (xiii). The figure of Bacon is that of an intellectual trying to negotiate his place within earthly, heavenly and diabolical hierarchies. Greene was himself familiar with such attitudes and struggles, and although there is little direct correlation between Greene and his character Bacon, there are still the parallels in their lifestyles of having attended university, and remaining unsatisfied, despite their increased knowledge.

This parallel may have enabled Greene to depict Bacon's character in a way that is more sympathetic than he otherwise would have. Bacon's redemption comes when he acknowledges that only the divine order is valid, and he repents, striving to submit himself to heavenly authority and the wishes of God's divinely-chosen monarch, King Henry. Greene depicts Bacon as a stereotypical warlock, and Bacon's redemption comes when he becomes human again, and is content with human ambitions. Whether Greene himself achieved this state of peaceful existence is beyond my capacity to prove one way or the other, but he must, at any rate, have had some admiration for those who did reach this state of contentment with themselves and the world.

This concern in ensuring that people were content with being human, and the proper sort of ambitions for mortals, was not a purely English phenomenon—it also manifests itself in the Germany of Gryphius' theatre. By limiting oneself to appropriate goals, a member of this society could also avoid any appearance of wrong-doing and maintain at least a facade of public piety. In the specific case of *Cardenio und Celinde*, it is difficult to differentiate between what was Gryphius' opinion, and what was the dominant mode of thought for that region of Germany. The play is strongly condemnatory of witches and the repugnant methods used by witchcraft, but in an era of inquisitions and seemingly random accusations, it was important not only to be innocent, but to appear to be innocent. Gryphius was himself an educated man, and hence less easily swayed by panics of the populace, but he must also have recognised the danger he could have landed himself in had he conveyed the wrong ideas of the occult. In creating the figure of Tyche, Gryphius clearly demonstrates his submission to the ecclesiastically-dictated position taken by the authorities of his day. In her, Gryphius authors a most stereotypical witch, with no redeeming qualities whatsoever.

Again, we, the audience, notice that Bacon repents of his actions, and that Tyche does not. We must therefore assume that each of these characters fulfills a function desired by their respective author. Greene changes his play from his source story of the two friars, in which Friar Bungay is sent to hell while engaged in a magicians' duel with Vandermast[8]. Miles, the character who in the play does ride off to hell on a demon's back, is a figure who is not as noble as the two friars, and for whom the audience need feel little sympathy (unless they were to imagine that he represents what the audience members would, or could, be). Tyche, in contrast to Miles, is the character whom no one would want to be, because Gryphius depicts her as an unredeemable witch who is unworthy of divine grace and redemption. Bacon has elements of both Tyche and Miles, but is able to recognise his mistake and turn back to God and the path of righteousness, despite some dubious actions which he commits in the course of the play.

The most obvious charge of misconduct against Bacon is the fact that he is, or seems, willing to help Prince Edward to deflower an otherwise chaste and virtuous maiden, Margaret. But one should note that before helping Edward fulfill his desires, Bacon and Edward watch the lovers through Bacon's prospective glass, and he tells Edward to "(s)it still, my lord, and mark the comedy" (vi, 48). If one reads "comedy" in the broadest sense of the word, that is, a story with a happy ending, then Bacon already knows what will come about in the strange love-triangle between Edward, Margaret and Lacy[9]. In several other places in the play, Bacon demonstrates his prophetic capacity, most obviously in the final scene, in which the friar foresees a stable and happy kingdom brought about by the marriage of Edward and Eleanor of Castile[10]. Bacon also records a strong sense of foreboding just before the two young scholars come to look through his prospective glass, when he says to Bungay, "by prospective skill/ I find this day shall fall out ominous./ Some deadly act shall 'tide me ere I sleep" (xiii, 12-14). As noted elsewhere, these two lads see their fathers engaged in a duel for the affections of fair Margaret, and when the fathers kill each other, so, too, do the sons. These two examples provide excellent evidence that Bacon has the ability to foretell some aspects of the future, and vindicate any imputations against his character in seeming to help Edward to sate his lust; Bacon is rather helping Edward to become a better friend and monarch, one who is able to control his passions and redirect them for the good of the country. Bacon, in his role as fortune-teller, becomes a tool of God, rather than just predicting the future for his own aggrandisement. This does not mean that Friar Bacon knows, or can discern, the whole of the future, but is only given glimpses of those bits which serve the turn of the Lord, rather than humankind[11].

This episode with Edward, Lacy and their lovers is one instance in this play in which Bacon's magic does not have a deleterious effect on those around him. Even though there are many negative side-effects to this love-story, most particularly the deaths of two generations of Lamberts and Serlsbys, Bacon's powers of prophecy are used to bring harmony to the lovers, and thereby to the nation with the union of Edward and Eleanor. Similarly, the characters in Gryphius' play try to determine their future, with both positive and negative effects.

Gryphius implicitly advocates in this play the use of astrology and interpreting the future by having Olympia comment on the effects of a passing comet. Olympia is the model of virtue for the whole play, and the central character of the play, as it is made clear in the play's "Vorrede". The play is ostensibly about love, how it can be taken too far by the passions and how it should be expressed. The proper expression of love is therefore a reflection of the correct relation between not only the two lovers, but also between the lovers and God. By transforming her passion for Cardenio into a temperate and chaste love for Lysander, Olympia becomes a model for the rest of the characters in the play, in particular, for Celinde and Cardenio. As Gryphius notes in the "Vorrede", his "vorsatz ist, zweyerley liebe, eine keusche, sittsame und doch inbrünstige in Olympien, eine rasende, tolle und verzweiflende in Celinden abzubilden" (1961, 264). This quotation shows that Olympia is Gryphius' ideal woman, and in a play as patently didactic as this one, especially on the topic of love, authorial intent cannot be overlooked when examining the roles and their importance to the play's structure.

Gryphius wrote Olympia's character with the intent of making her a model for all women, and an example of what form love should take. Gryphius went on to state that Olympia, before the play has begun, "schwebet in steten schmertzen, bis sie bloß nach der ehre als dem einigen zweck zielet" (1961, 264). If there was any doubt that Olympia provides a model of behaviour, it is laid to rest by this passage, in which Gryphius declares that Olympia discovers a single, suitable goal for which she can strive. As the figure around whom all other characters in the play rotate, albeit Celinde vicariously through Cardenio, Olympia is a shining light and example for the other characters in the play, both in pious behaviour and in terms of lessons to be learned about love. The audience sees her for the first time in the third and central act, in which she offers her perspective on events past and future. This centrality of her voice shows that her point of view is the most important, and puts the statements made by the other characters into a broader context.

It is highly significant that she remarks on the meaning of a passing comet, and the effect it can have on people's lives. In this third act, Olympia is talking with her brother, Vireno, and reflecting on the happenings in her life, leading up to and following her marriage to Lysander; she states that "wenn der comet erblasst, entdeckt er gift und pest" (III, 116); this statement proves that she, and therefore her creator Gryphius, is familiar with the importance of such astrological portents, and that he, through the character of Olympia, does not find astrology and astronomy intrinsically sinful. Stuart Clark notes in his compendious work on magic, *Thinking with Demons*, astrology was part of what the people of the seventeenth century considered to be "natural magic". He states that

> the modern reader, whose sense of what is meant by the category 'natural' is likely to be affronted by the inclusion of astrology, talismans, sympathetic action, and the like. But here it is our expectations that are at fault; that is, we expect something called 'natural magic' to be divisible into its 'natural' and its 'magical'

> components. For the Neoplatonists, the relationship between objects in the material world and the celestial powers that ruled their behaviour *was* ... natural" (1997, 218).

This quotation demonstrates that despite our modern desire to separate magic and the occult into easily recognisable distinctions of various gradations of superstition, the people of that era made no such differentiation. So for Olympia to comment on astrological signs and their impact on the world indicates her involvement in the realms of what we nowing sweepingly call "magic".

But in the play, the character Tyche also makes references to the stars and their impact on humanity. Throughout the play, and even in the "Vorrede", Tyche is the figure whom the audience is expected to regard with revulsion. In this preface to the play, Gryphius comments on Tyche's arts, and calls them "verfluchte[n] zauberey" (1961, 264); a statement like this does not allow the audience or reader to regard Tyche as an ambiguous figure—she is an embodiment of Sin. But she, too, makes comments about the stars and their influences on the events of this world; in the speech in which she convinces Celinde to participate in damnable acts, Tyche glorifies the power that can be theirs through the use of spirits and astrology: "die natur durch neue macht zu binden / Schweiff sternen, irrend feur und blitzen zu entzünden" (II, 213-14). This statement makes an obvious reference to astronomy, in both cause and effect, but what makes Olympia's statement acceptable, and Tyche's damnable? There are too-easy answers such as the fact that Olympia does not sacrifice any children to demons, or commit such outrageous crimes—this does not account for the fact that both Virtue and Vice use the same tools for interpreting preternatural events. I think that the real difference between the two women lies in how they use their knowledge, as well as in how they acquire it.

Olympia seeks a knowledge of God's will discreetly, and is content with interpreting portents as they appear, whereas Tyche is not content to accept God's will, and actively seeks to influence her destiny and the destiny of those around her. Gryphius thereby makes clear that he feels it is not a sin to try to understand what God wants us to do in this world, but that it is a sin to try to shape or influence God's will for us, and therefore our own destinies[12]. This aspect of the play puts it very much in the tradition of the Faust legend, but in this case, Tyche is the over-ambitious character who refuses to accept what God has deemed to be her lot in life. One can only assume that God tried to warn Tyche of the dangers of her actions before her fall, as God warned Celinde with the appearance of Marcellus' ghost, but that Tyche failed to heed the divine advice. And we as audience can only assume that Tyche will meet the same fate as Dr. Faustus, as a punishment for the over-reaching desire to control her own destiny.

Tyche's use of astrology leads the audience into a bit of a quandary with regard to what was considered to be "legitimate" knowledge by the people of that era. It is in itself a problem that she uses astrology. The audience could imagine that Tyche is fulfilling her role of demonstrating the dangers of forbidden knowledge. The real problem arises from the fact that Olympia also comments on the significance of a passing comet. Olympia is a model of piety and chaste knowledge, so for her to make a favourable remark about astrology gives it a distinct air of legitimacy. Just as Tyche wears her character in her name, so too does Olympia's name reflect her character. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, some of the synonyms for this name are "celestial, magnificent, superior". Given this differentiation even in the meanings of their names, the audience can only anticipate that everything Olympia does is righteous, and Tyche's actions are evil and "malicious". But they both use astrological portents in the play, and yet their characters cannot remotely be considered equivalent.

There are two possible ways to explain this situation: the nature of the knowledge is legitimated by the character of the person using it, or that this knowledge is acceptable judging by how it is acquired and used. I think that the first explanation can be accredited insofar as it affected persons of high social standing. Witchcraft accusations were most common against those, especially women, of low social rank, and who did not have any social power and lacked the ability to comport themselves in public like their better-educated contemporaries. Sigrid Brauner argues that

> (m)ost of the victims (of witchcraft trials) were women, and many were illiterate peasants — as were most of their accusers. By contrast, those in the judicial apparatus were university-trained men from the urban middle classes. People from disparate backgrounds with clashing ideas about what constituted appropriate behavior for women faced each other in court. (1995, 113)

So at least part of the acceptability of Olympia's use of astrology versus that of Tyche can be attributed to their respective social classes, but Tyche's detestable behaviour would be intolerable in any character who is described by the author as a model for the feminine ideal.

The second explanation is, therefore, the more plausible of the two. Tyche uses her knowledge in a cruel and malevolent way, living up to the maliciousness of her name, whereas Olympia makes her comment about comets in a very casual way and proceeds with her conversation with Vireno.

The difference in the way these two characters use their knowledge of astrology must be an indication of the way the society of that day viewed magic, that is, that there are various gradations of occultist knowledge, which could be either evil or good. The evil forms of magic would be the negative type embodied by Tyche, in which spirits are used to acquire forbidden knowledge, and this knowledge is used as a means to perform cruel and unspeakable things to the living and the dead, or, conversely, to use the living and the dead cruelly in order to acquire even more knowledge and power. Tyche's manipulation of her environment through these acts is heresy on every level, including her disobedience of God and her disrespect, through murder and necromancy, for the physical universe which was created by that same God. In contrast to Tyche's stands Olympia's use of what is occultist knowledge in the broadest sense of the term. She uses her insight in an honest attempt to understand the workings of God in this world, and, as far as the audience can tell, has never flayed children alive or performed any of the other atrocities described by Tyche. Olympia is, to remain within the patriarchal structures (and strictures) of Baroque Germany, "discreetly" gaining her awareness of how God communicates His will to our world.

In contrast to Gryphius' play, Greene's play has no subtle gradations of occult knowledge or manipulation of spirits. Part of this absence can be attributed to the fact that "God" does not figure as largely in the play as He does in Gryphius' piece. Greene's play does not involve any manner of direct divine intervention, and so it is left to the characters themselves to repent and to recognise their own errors, rather than having God challenge the characters as He does in Gryphius' play. The figure of Bacon in Greene's play seems to have an all-or-nothing relationship to the occult and the spiritual world. He is either heavily involved in science and nigromancy, or he repents completely of this intellectual realm, as he does when he realises the mistakes of his life, saying,

> "I tell thee, Bungay, it repents me sore
> That ever Bacon meddled in this art ...
> (And) are instances that Bacon must be damned
> For using devils to countervail his God...
> Bungay, I'll spend the remnant of my life
> In pure devotion, praying to my God
> That he would save what Bacon vainly lost" (xiii, 85-108)

Bacon utterance shows his desire to regain his own soul and to earn with God's help "what Bacon vainly lost." But there is only small indication in the play as a whole, and none in this speech, that a little bit of magic is a good thing, and so we as readers can only assume that Greene wanted his audience to avoid the risk of the taint of the occult, or else we could end up like

Miles. Likewise, Gryphius' play does allow a certain amount of academic freedom and license, in that he implies that a discrete knowledge and investigation of God's ways would be acceptable. This attitude in fact then shows that Gryphius had a certain amount of tolerance for academic ambiguity, and struggled himself with the problem of where to draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable knowledge.

This academic freedom must also have been present not only in Leiden, but also in the German academies of Breslau, where this play was first performed, because in my experience schools are usually the first place in which people, most often parents or principals, object to any imagined controversy, so Gryphius must have felt confident about his presentation of Olympia's use of astrology in the play. I think that this interpretation of the social aspects of the acceptability of the occult is one with potentially far-reaching implications. It is commonly accepted that "official" Baroque society was more superstitious, to use the modern, pejorative description, than is our modern society. As Keith Thomas notes in his classic, *Religion and the Decline of Magic*, there was "a multitude of other beliefs which we know to have been widely current... This last category to be considered comprises a miscellaneous variety of actions and circumstances which were thought to bring unfavourable consequences in their train for some unstated reason" (1971, 623). In other words, people of this era were highly superstitious, and found all manner of actions to be inherently "bad luck". In my opinion, the citizens of that era would be more likely to call these beliefs "spiritual" rather than "superstitious", because they, as Gryphius and Greene demonstrate in their plays, were able to see God and the Devil in all aspects of the universe.

By logical extension, if these attitudes were tolerated within the environment of the academies, Gryphius' scholarly peers must also have deemed his comments about the nature of magic to be acceptable, or they were perhaps commonly-accepted standpoints at that time. The ideas about such a "sliding scale" of occultist knowledge certainly could not have been offensive to the era if the play was, in all likelihood, first performed in the boys' academy. At this time, and as noted earlier, there was little distinction made between "scientific" and "religious" truth, and the two spheres of influence regularly crossed paths. This lack of diffentiation between science and religion arose because the people of this era assumed that since God created the world and made the rules for its governance, God could also then break these same rules whenever it suited His divine will; such actions were then called "miracles", and there were several such incidents in Gryphius' play. As D.P. Walker notes in his study of Ficino and his magic (1975, 156), it is almost impossible to separate magic from Christianity, because Christ himself performed miracles, and specifically told his disciples that faith can move mountains (Mark 12:23). But in saying this, Jesus does not explain how the miracle will be effected, so it was not unreasonable, even for the most pious of Christians, to attempt to effect similar feats. Gryphius' play, by condemning Tyche and her methods, shows that only God can perform miracles, as he does when He sends the two spirits to chastise Celinde and Cardenio. And while Gryphius thought that scientific investigation was good[13], he was likely uncomfortable with the instability of the boundaries between natural philosophy, magic and religion. By making the spirits in this play either infernal, as those affiliated with Tyche, or beyond human control, as with the Angel of Death and Marcellus' ghost, Gryphius effectively tells his audience to shun the spirit world. For Gryphius, attempting to control higher beings is a sign of human vanity, and too risky for comfort[14].

Because both God and Devil were omnipresent, it was vital to all members of the Baroque society to orient themselves towards the forces of Good rather than Evil, and to be on their guard against the constant temptation presented by the Devil and his minions. For Gryphius, this temptation took the form of worldly concerns and the hubris which ails humanity. He railed against "vanitas" and the tendency of humans to focus on themselves, rather than to think about God or the life hereafter. In the case of *Cardenio und Celinde*, Gryphius uses the examples of love and magic which can lead people away from God. While love, or lust some might say, is the primary motivator in this play, it can lead to even more dangerous sins, such as witchcraft and the heresy represented by the black arts. Tyche is the symbol for all of the evil that can come from dabbling with powers beyond mortal control; she is a temptress for those around her, trying to seduce them into following the same doomed path which she follows. Thanks to a loving and omnipresent God, He intervenes to show Cardenio and Celinde the error of their ways, and in so doing, defeats another attempt by the Devil to win souls for himself. Gryphius' play is an affirmation of the power of God in this world, and is intended as a reminder to his audience of the dangers presented by the world, and a sermon against trusting any other force than the Lord. While the play is rigid and overly rhetorical to our modern taste, Gryphius was widely admired by his peers in Germany for his skill as a playwright, so he must have provided his audience with entertaining, as well as edifying, material to suit their taste[15]. His interest in curent affairs and teaching his audience is also obvious in his play, *Carolus Stuardus*, in which he chronicles the regicide of Charles I in England, certainly big news at that time. This admiration for Gryphius demonstrates that drama was received by his audience in the same spirit it was offered: as an educational warning about the wide variety of dangers to a soul present in this fallen world, and that only a simple faith in God can save humanity.

Like Gryphius, Greene also argues for a return to a simple faith in God; as has been noted throughout this discussion, Greene's play depicts a patent distrust of all manner of higher learning, and the pride in self to which this extra knowledge can lead. The character of Friar Bacon stands mute at the end of the play, for earlier, when he used his art to predict the future, or to control spirits which should have been beyond mortal control, he caused some manner of misfortune or disaster. Bacon says that he "finds by deep prescience of mine art, / Which I once temper'd in my secret cell" (xvi, 42-43) a happy and prosperous future for England and the marriage of Edward and Eleanor. He qualifies this use of his "art" by saying that he was silent at the wedding because he was "(r)epentant for the follies of my youth, / That magic's secret mysteries misled" (xvi, 35-36). This statement tempers the audience's reaction to his later statement on using his magic in one last prophecy, and makes them realise that although he still has powers beyond those of ordinary people, Bacon will refrain from using them beyond the support of the Church and Crown. His magic is no longer an obscure mystery which he practiced outside of the realm of society, but rather, a knowledge which he abjures, as shown by his repentance, but will use on the command of the divinely-appointed monarch.

This sparing and reluctant use of his magic shows that magic does still have some place in society, but only when it serves the will of God or His appointed ministers. So in the end, despite all of the disasters to which his magic leads, and for all of his repentance for his hubris, Bacon is still willing to use his magic under certain, defined circumstances. These circumstances bear an astonishing resemblance to the circumstances depicted in Gryphius' play, namely, that magic or things of a supra-human knowledge need not be sinful if used discreetly and for the sake of understanding God's will. Bacon's knowledge serves God in that he informs the crown prince and his new bride of the divine sanction for their marriage, and that the new couple is fulfilling God's will, for if God did not approve of their marriage, there could be none of the happiness portended by Bacon.

Each of these plays is strongly condemnatory of almost all manner of occult activity, with the exception of a few, highly-defined situations. Both Greene and Gryphius make little or no effort to differentiate between various gradations of occult knowledge, and perhaps deliberately confuse elements of high magic with lowly conjuration and necromancy. This confusion allows the authors to issue a warning to their audiences to avoid all contact with matters if the occult. Nonetheless, each author does make a small concession that there may indeed be some types of occult activity which are offensive neither to God nor Man, but each of these instances is so minor as to be all but opaque to all but the closest of readings or examinations. All types of hidden knowledge, which could in any way undermine God's authority and mastery of the universe, were to be shunned at the very peril of one's soul. These plays both indicate a strong fear of the unknown, and demonstrate to present-day readers the very real dread which the Devil and his minions inspired in Baroque audiences.

Conclusion: Curiosity and Ambition —Powerful Traits of Humanity

The plays of Andreas Gryphius and Robert Greene each take a different tack on the problem and presence of the occult in their respective societies. In *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Greene focuses on the scientific and educational aspects of necromancy, while Gryphius' *Cardenio und Celinde* focuses on the vanitas of his characters, and the need to shun the temptations of this world. Nonetheless, both do agree on a number of points, which should come as no surprise, despite the differences in their respective educations and formative years. In addition, the areas on which both Greene and Gryphius agree are interesting, in that each of them seems to be telling his audience to be "lowly wise", that is, that their audiences should avoid all aspects of occult knowledge and activity, even if the authors themselves depict certain aspects of these activities as legitimate and acceptable. This argumentation would sit well with the Church's historical attitude towards such activities, which were, as Valerie Flint argues, about a

> double process. One, firstly, of a rejection of *magia*, a rejection shared by imperial Rome and many of its most powerful medieval heirs; and then, and centrally, a complex second one of the second thoughts of some of Rome's early medieval successors. These second thoughts led ... not merely to the halting of the process of rejection and to the tolerance of certain "magical" survivals, but to the active rescue, preservation, and encouragement of very many of these last; and all for the furtherance of a relationship between people and the supernatural that, it was fervently believed, would improve human life. (1991, 4)

This quotation shows that there was a strong history of magic during the Middle Ages, and, as has been apparent throughout this thesis, which the Renaissance continued to further. During the Reformation, there was a distinct hardening of the positions of both the Protestant and Catholic churches against such secret or hidden knowledge, but nonetheless a strong desire to know, even if the Church denied this knowledge to the general population.

The London theatre scene for which Greene wrote was vastly more sophisticated and popular than that of Gryphius' Germany, at least in terms of awareness of dramatic potential and efficacy, even if not in scholarly learning. The theatre-goers in London were from a wide range of social strata, and so by sheer weight of numbers there were many more of them attending dramatic productions in that city's lively theatre scene. These audiences had, in all likelihood, less formal education than the audiences for whom Gryphius wrote his plays (the educated burghers and supporters of the German academies), but the London crowds had a different sort of critical awareness, in that they were used to seeing plays of all types and had thereby developed a sense for what was, and what was not, dramatically feasible and entertaining. Gryphius' plays, in contrast, were aimed at the middle-class burghers anf their families who would attend plays at the boys' academies in Germany. His audiences were likely better educated, and thereby better able to appreciate the rhetorical sophistication Gryphius displays in his dramas.

In this thesis, I have sought to bring a rudimentary knowledge of the occult to the analysis of each of these plays, and to illuminate thereby an aspect of each of these plays which have been ignored for too long. Each of these plays has reshaped my understanding of the Renaissance and Baroque eras, in that they have afforded me the opportunity to investigate closely the interactions between author and audience. These theatre events were an expression of community in a sometimes chaotic world. As I showed in the previous chapters, the societies of these two countries operated under heavy religious constraints and ideologies. The Church did not openly sanction any form of occult practices, but there still remained the need to warn people about the dangers of such activities, without going into details as to what these activities (it was believed) could accomplish.

Drama turned out to be an effective means of educating the populace without being too much of a threat to the Church and Its teachings. Each of these plays does support, both implicitly and explicitly, the position taught by the Church of that era. Both plays openly condemn magic, the divining of spirits and communication with the dead; in this way, the plays support the most obvious position of the Church in criticising such diabolical activities. But, that said, each of the plays is also in alignment with the Church's tacit tolerance of investigations into occult matters by its clergy. Renaissance magi like Ficino, himself a clergyman, were not uncommon, and followed in the tradition of the greatest magi of the Middle Ages, such as Albertus Magnus and Bernard de Treves, both of whom were also churchmen. As long as these scholars kept their researches and debate within the arena of the Church, they were tolerated, or even sanctioned, by Church authorities. These plays fit very much into that same mould, in that they admonish the uneducated to shun things which are beyond their comprehension, but both works, while going out of their way to condemn magic and necromancy, still allow some small avenue of expression for forbidden knowledge. This small allowance can be most clearly seen, although only upon close reading and examination, in Friar Bacon's prophecies at the end of his play, and in Olympia's knowledge of astrology and the consequences of a comet blazing across the sky.

The part of each of these plays I find most fascinating is in their obvious attempt to control who has knowledge within the society, and what levels of knowledge are acceptable for certain of the characters. To be more specific: Gryphius allows Olympia's inquisitiveness and acquisition of information beyond normal human understanding, even though he depicts Tyche, who also uses astrology to gain some of her knowledge, as a most vile creature who embodies all of the negative traits of the demonic witch. Similarly, in Greene's play, *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Friar Bacon realises that his "arts" are an abomination to God's divine order, and repents of his mistakes, and abjures his magical craft. But he only does so for his own sake, and when his monarch, King Henry, commands Bacon to make a prophecy, he complies. So in this case, as in Gryphius, occult knowledge is allowed within certain unstated, but understood, parameters. This allowance of an otherwise forbidden knowledge signals a deeper meaning in these two plays.

Each of the playwrights ensures that a specific hierarchy is established within their respective plays. In Greene's play, Edward marries Eleanor of Castile, for the betterment of his kingdom, Lacy marries Margaret because he recognises her inherent nobility, and Friar Bacon recognises the pre-eminence of God and His representative on Earth, King Henry. Likewise in Gryphius' play, Olympia gains an awareness of the proper avenues and expressions for love, marrying Lysander, while Cardenio learns to cool his passion and lust for revenge, and Celinde gives up her earthly loves to commit her life to God. All of these actions indicate God's strong presence in both of these plays, namely that God does everything in His power to make the characters realise that their actions are damnable. The characters must repent of all of these actions and the hubris that motivate them in order to remain within the ordained hierarchies of God's universe. Within this established order, there is room for an investigation into the mysteries of the cosmos, but not in a random manner, and not for everyone. In Gryphius' play, Olympia's curiosity for knowledge of God and His will is made acceptable through her upright character and the discreteness of her enquiries, while in Greene's play, the king's order legitimates Bacon's prophecy.

I cannot help but think of stereotypes of the Middle Ages, in which the laity were denied all access to education[1] , and even of the educated class, that is the clergy, only a certain few were allowed to participate in relatively free academic debate. In the case of these plays, only certain characters are allowed to investigate the nature of God's will, and in the case of Bacon, only when the king, as God's representative on Earth, sanctions this prediction. Instead of saying these two plays follow medieval hierarchies, as I am tempted to do, I cannot help but think that these plays are rather an expression of human nature. It lies within humanity to deny access to all knowledge, or to have truly free rein to debate from whatever position one chooses.

At the roots of Western culture, such as in Greek mythology or the stories of the Bible, the quest for knowledge has been depicted as having grave consequences: Prometheus is condemned eternally to have his liver pecked at by an eagle, and Even and Adam are banished from the Garden of Eden, which represents earthly bliss, for learning the difference between Good and Evil. As Roger Shattuck notes in his encyclopedic work, *Forbidden Knowledge*, "(p)roverbs in every language tell us that it is possible to know too much for our own good. Many great myths and legends explore the perils of knowledge" (1996, 1). This quotation shows the universality of denying omniscience to humanity—humans themselves place constraints upon human awareness. In the cases of *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay* and *Cardenio und Celinde*, neither play proposes a radically new way of interpreting the universe. Rather, each play is highly traditional, both in terms of the knowledge each one forbids and the investigations each allows. These traditional elements have led me to change my belief that the Renaissance was a revolutionary era. In the end, the people of this era were still captives to their own culture and values, no matter how loudly they proclaimed a "rebirth" of society and learning.

Notes:

Introduction:

[1] In his introduction to Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, D. Allen Carroll (1994, 20) notes that in contributing to the forgery of Greene's repentance writing, Henry Chettle was taking advantage of Greene's name as a writer, the value of which Greene himself well knew.

[2] When referring to "German" or "Germany", I recognise it as a political anachronism, but for the sake of brevity in this thesis I will use these terms to avoid saying "German-speaking regions" or similarly awkward formulations.

[3] For a general assessment of Gryphius' historical importance and impact, see Marian Szyrocki's *Andreas Gryphius: Sein Leben und Werk* (1964), or Eberhard Mannack's study, *Andreas Gryphius* (1968).

[4] See Eda Sagarra and Peter Skrine's book, *A Companion to German Literature from 1500 to the Present* (1997) for a discussion of Opitz and his effect on subsequent generations of German writers.

[5] Again, see Szyrocki's book (1964), or Judith P. Aikin's introduction to German drama of the time, *German Baroque Drama* (1982). For an appraisal of how Gryphius has been received through the centuries, see *Reading Andreas Gryphius* by Erika A. Metzger and Michael M. Metzger (1994).

[6] As proof of Gryphius' familiarity with a wide range of genres and styles, please refer to Judith Aikin's article "Genre Definition and Genre Confusion in Gryphius' Double Bill" (1983).

[7] It is important to note that the professional theatre in London "appealed to the entire spectrum of London's population" (Gurr 1996, 10). This universality meant that both playwrights and actors had their work cut out for them in keeping their audiences amused. Gurr goes on to note that there was "greater use of the more expensive city venues and a widening gap between the upper and lower social reaches that the playing companies catered for. This aggregation of settled companies and familiar repertories created a new situation. Companies competing for the same maket share of audiences became rivals. Rivalry created differences between the leading companies. The survival of so many of the plays written in this later period [1612-1642] makes it pssible to see some of the complex interactions that took place between company repertories and audience expectations, and the ways in which audience prejudice was acknowledged by the commissioning companies and the knowing writers" (17). This discrimination shown by London's audiences clearly demonstrates a refinement of tase and the evolution of styles and fashions, all built upon the early hey-days of the London theatre scene in the late 1580s and throughout the 1590s.

[8] Ironically, even once the playwright and acting company had lured the crowds into their theatre, they still had to compete for the audience's attention, as noted by Clifford John Williams in his book, *Theatres and Audiences* (1970); he states that "the attention of an audience, busy with apples, notes, ale and gossip, a large section of whom were of no fixed abode in the playhouse, had to be caught and held quickly, and to some purpose. Actors and dramatists became very resourceful in devising effective openings for their plays" (45-46). And as Andrew Gurr argues, "Access to London audiences laid demands on the companies to produce new plays at a uniquely rapid pace. Habitual playgoers, a phenomenon unique to London, soon grew familiar with each compay's repertoire of plays and demanded new versions of the same product" (1996, 20). This quotation highlights the pressures and successes open to the aggressive and effective theatre company, but they had to earn their livelihoods with their audience, who were suddenly becoming much more adept at judging the quality of a play.

[9] For a good discussion of the role of the English *Komödianten*, see Aikin's description (1982, 20-29), or Gerhardt Hoffmeister's article "The English Comedians in Germany" (1983). See also Szyrocki's argument (1964, 103-4) that these English troupes played in Silesia the same year that Gryphius wrote one of his most successful comedies, *Absurda Comica, oder Herr Peter Squentz*.

[10] The Jesuits' plays were all performed in Latin, and so required much physical comedy and technical innovation to communicate their message to the largely illiterate audiences, at least for their productions staged during the Lenten season. The levels of

comprehension and sophistication increased, of course, when plays were written for, and performed in, Jesuit schools. The plays themlselves tended towards farce and mockery when dealing with magic and things occult. For a more detailed discussion of the Jesuit tradition, see Aikin's introduction in *German Baroque Drama* (1982); or, for a more detailed analysis, see Johannes Mueller's *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge vom Anfang (1555) bis zum Hochbarock (1665)* (1930).

[11] I will define "occultism", as well as "magic" and "witchcraft" later in this discussion.

[12] Brian P. Levack notes (1992, 109) that magic was suppressed, along with residual "pagan" beliefs, to a large extent because they were viewed as a threat to organised religion. Henry Kamen, in his book *The Iron Century*, is even more explicit when he states that "the persecution (of witches) ... can be said to have arisen from a conjunction between popular superstition and theological fantasy" (1971, 239). Added to this chorus of voices decrying the injustice of the witch trials is Stuart Clark's philosphical discussion on the relationship between language and witchcraft (1997, 1-10). He states flatly that "The entity 'witchcraft' has turned out to be a non-entity, because for the most part it had no referents in the real world" (4).

[13] D.P. Walker argues in his book, *Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella* (1975, 51-53) that Ficino was elitist in his teachings, specifically to prevent his writings from leading the ignorant into the idolatry of magic; Ficino was, however, also very concerned about the theological orthodoxy of his views and struggled to reconcile his beliefs with official Church doctrine.

[14] The concurrence of Christian attitudes towards witchcraft is demonstrated by the fact that Protestant and Catholic judges on the Continent, both secular and ecclesiastical, had a copy of the *Malleus Maleficarum* on their benches (Summers 1948, xi)..

[15] For a discussion of the historical background to these accusations of heresy, see David Christie-Murray's book, *A History of Heresy* (1976).

[16] My definitions have been shaped by Valerie Flint's *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (1991), Marcel Mauss' *A General Theory of Magic* (1972), John Mebane's *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age* (1989), and most decisively by Jeffrey Russell's *A History of Witchcraft* (1980, especially 37-54).

[17] By "witches" I will refer exclusively to female practitioners, and "warlocks" or "wizards" will then refer to their male equivalents.

[18] Many of the trials were highly misogynistic, and focussed largely on socially ostracised women. For a feminist assessment of this trend, go to Lyndal Roper's treatment of the topic in *Oedipus and the Devil* (1994).

[19] Please see especially Russell, pp. 35, 55-89, as well as Brian P. Levack's *The Witch-hunt in Early Modern Europe*, 37, 74-77.

[20] For a detailed analysis and investigation of the "new historicist" methodology, please see H. Aram Veeser's book, *The New Historicism* (1989). For a study which places new historicism within its respective historical context, please refer to Richard Wilson's "Introduction: Historicising New Historicism" (1992).

[21] The importance of schools in the presentation of German drama of this period, and specifically in regard to Gryphius, will be examined more closely later in this discussion.

[22] Thomas I. Bacon's *Martin Luther and the Drama* (1976) provides an excellent introduction to Luther's, and Lutherans', attitudes towards drama at this time. He notes that the godliness of drama was debated within the Church at this time (23), but also that Luther seemed to change his views towards drama depending upon whom he was addressing (29), while trying to stay within the core of his system of belief.

[23] See H.C. Erik Midelfort's book, *Witch Hunting in Southwestern Germany 1562-1684* (1972), for an empirical study of the nature and extent of the German witch hunts, and which is not limited strictly to the Southwest region.

[24] Again, for a more detailed examination of the Jesuit drama of this period and its impact, please see *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge vom Anfang (1555) bis zum Hochbarock (1666)* (1930) by Johannes Müller, or Judith Aikin's survey of Baroque drama for a more general discussion of the topic.

---

[25] For a thorough investigation of the history of English witchcraft, see Keith Thomas' book, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (1971); for a discussion of the history of continental witchcraft, see Valerie Flint's book, *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe* (1991).

[26] I will use the Devil as both a character name and as a designation for forces representing Evil, thereby remaining within the Christian tradition which occupies the central role in this analysis of successors to the Faust legend.

[27] For a more complete discussion, please refer to Stewart Easton's book, *Roger Bacon* (1970), especially 191-202.

[28] For my discussion of Faust's literary and cultural precursor's, I am indebted to the book by Philip Palmer and Robert More, *The Sources of the Faust Tradition* (1965).

[29] See the introduction to *Doctor Fausti Weheklag* by Helmut Wiemken (1961), or the "Einleitung" to the Faust story in *Volksbücher des 16. Jahrhunderts*, edited by Felix Bobetag (1989), among many others.

[30] For a challenge to the almost-universally held view of the source for Greene's play, see Charles Hieatt's article: "A New Source for *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*" (1981).

[31] Seltzer argues that Greene's magical story in fact preceded Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, with Greene's plays appearing between 1588-1591, arguing that Marlowe's play only appeared in 1592 (1963, ix). In contrast, Steane feels that Marlowe's play may have been written as early as 1588, or as late as 1592 (1986, 12); regardless, the existence of these plays demonstrates both a concern on the part of society and interest in the topic on the part of theatre-goers in late Elizabethan times.

[32] As noted earlier, Marlowe wrote his play between 1588-1592, so within five years of its first publication in Germany, Dr. Faust's story appeared on the English stage. The dispersal was equally quick for most of the other Protestant regions in Europe; Palmer and More note (1965, 131) that the 1587 "Spies book" was published in English, Dutch and French before the end of the century.

[33] Henry Kamen (1971, 252) notes that "all the churches insisted on accusing each other of atheism and idolatry." He goes on to argue that "(i)t is usually held that both the changes and the superstition were products of an age of intense belief and credulity: but could they not equally have been the fruit of incredulity?" I think these quotations accurately capture the two extremes of argumentation on religion in this era; both positions demonstrate the religiosity and indifference towards the Church which stretched through all classes of society. Each stance was adopted by a given number of people at that time, as Kamen argues, and so, correspondingly, each extreme taken by modern historians can find proof in its own support. At any rate, I think the widely varying attitudes towards religion in this era can be summed up in the phrase: "religious uncertainty."

[34] Evidence of this can be seen in the fact that Luther hated it when any of his adherents and defenders were called "Lutherans". For a more detailed investigation of Luther and his impact on the sixteenth century, see V.H.H. Green's *Luther and the Reformation* (1969) or Richard Friedenthal's *Luther - His Life and Times* (1970).

[35] For an appraisal of the war and its effect on literature, see Michael M. Metzger and Erika A. Metzger's article, "The Thirty Years War and Its Impact on Literature" (1983).

[36] Keith Wrightson (1982, 201) makes the very pragmatic observation that people at this time were often religious enough, in their own way, but had little patience in waiting for the joys of the next world—they were too busy trying to survive the tribulations of this one. And it was in order to aid their survival that many of the common folk subscribed to the "supplementary" beliefs we now call witchcraft.

[37] Although Levack (1992, 105) notes that both Luther and Calvin themselves were much more concerned with the Devil than with witchcraft; it was their followers who equated the two, and began persecuting witches and warlocks as heretics.

[38] Some of the more notable and radical new branches of the Christian Church included the Anabaptists, as well as communal ideologues such as the Hutterites.

Chapter 1:

[1] Although Hugo Friedrich, in his biography of Montaigne, argues that the French man of letters was a closet atheist; see Friedrich, *Montaigne* (1949), Chapter 3, especially the section on "Apologie de Raymond Sebond" (119 ff).

[2] Much of the redemption of Gryphius' reputation has occurred within the English-speaking academic world, and therefore a significant proportion of my secondary sources will be in English; this bias does not represent a linguistic preference, but rather, the present state of Gryphius scholarship. In addition to long-time Gryphius scholars like Marian Szyrocki, Hugh Powell and Eberhard Mannack, English-speaking scholars such as Judith Aikin, Thomas Best and Blake Lee Spahr have joined the investigation into Gryphius and his writings.

[3] See work by Aikin, Powell and Spahr for examples of this renewed interest. There are also a number of essay collections on Gryphius and his plays, including Gerhardt Hoffmeister's *German Baroque Literature, The European Perspective* (1983) and the edition from the Stiftung Gerhart-Hauptmann-Haus (1993): *Andreas Gryphius: Weltgeschick und Lebenszeit: Ein schlesischer Barockdichter aus deutscher und polnischer Sicht*.

[4] For a discussion of the didactic role of Gryphius dramas, see the article by Günter Berghaus, "Andreas Gryphius' *Carolus Stuardus*—Formkunstwerk oder politisches Lehrstück?" (1984); this article touches on the topic of didacticism in regards to Gryphius' drama on England's regicide of Charles I.

[5] For an particularly good discussion of this aspect of Gryphius poetry and drama, see Will Hasty's article "The Order of Chaos: On *Vanitas* in the Work of Andreas Gryphius" (1989, 145-57).

[6] For a further discussion of the moralism of Gryphius' plays, please refer to Thomas Best's article "'Schädliche Neigungen' in Gryphius' *Leo Armenius*" (1986).

[7] As Williams notes (1995, 17) in his study of witchcraft, all levels of European society had a knowledge of witchcraft which " reflected not only familiarity with the practice of magic but also caution, fear, and curiosity toward such a practice." A drama such as Gryphius' plays smoothly into these attitudes by indulging the audience's inquisitiveness about magic, while at the same time confirming the caution and even fear which this magic aroused; the audience was thusly shown that even though an area of potential interest, magic was far too dangerous to dabble in.

[8] Robert H. West, *The Invisible World, A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama* (1939); Wertheim, Albert, "The Presentation of Sin in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*" in *Criticism* (1974); Towne, Frank, "'White Magic' in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*?" in *Modern Language Notes* (1952).

[9] A large part of the problem in identifying Greene's early activities lies in the sheer prevalence of his name; at the suspected time of his birth, there were "at least eight Robert Greene's" living in Norwich proper (Collins 1905, 1).

[10] Keith Wrightson (1982, 189) states that "places in the endowed schools, then, were largely and increasingly monopolized by the rural and urban élite, a tiny proportion of the national population. What was true of these schools was even more true of the institutions of higher education. The student body of Oxford was fairly evenly divided between youths of gentle birth ... youths of 'plebeian' origin... Few of the latter were of humble origins." Wrightson goes on to note that the same was true of Cambridge.

[11] Most commentators feel that Greene's alleged marriage, and desertion of his wife, took place during these Oxford years. The only evidence for the existence of the wife is in Greene's pseudo-autobiographical repentance writings, and the attacks of his bitter academic enemy, Gabriel Harvey. The alleged marriage is irrelevant to this discussion, but for a fuller exploration of the issue, see Crupi, 7-13.

[12] For an in-depth discussion of these "Wits" and their social milieu, see Richard Helgerson's book, *Elizabethan Prodigals* (1976).

[13] As Julian Martin notes in his article, "Natural Philosophy and its Public Concerns" (1991, 102), the "interplay of the philosophical and the political can be ... illustrated by considering the general character of the philosophic endeavours supported at royal European courts ... and the endemic negotiations of natural philosophers for improved

social credit." While this quotation does not directly address the masters of arts degrees held by most of the University Wits, it does underline a distinct view towards the social climbing efforts of many university graduates at this time.

[14] For such autobiographical readings of Greene's works, see the work of J. Churton Collins, *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* (1905) or John Clark Jordan, *Robert Greene* (1965). Interestingly, in his introduction to *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit*, D. Allen Carroll argues that the book was either largely written, or cobbled together, by the book's publisher, Henry Chettle (1994, 1ff).

[15] The morally edifying nature of drama is noted at least as far back as Aristotle's *Poetics* (although he, in turn, was disagreeing with Plato's almost complete condemnation of the verbal arts). Aristotle argues in the fourth section of his treatise that "men find pleasure in viewing representations because it turns out that they learn and infer what each thing is" (1989, 44). Thus Aristotle demonstrates the didactic nature of performance, and builds upon his observation from section two of the *Poetics* that the "objects imitated are either better than or worse than or like the norm" (1989, 43). With this very basic view of the public and representational nature of drama, it is not difficult to imagine Greene's play as an attempt at education, that is, to morally improve his audience so that they might imitate the actions of the characters on stage, and in turn, to learn the same lessons those characters learn. In an era in which religion was an integral part of every facet of life, it played an important role in education, even, or perhaps especially, in a forum as public as a London theatre.

[16] As noted in conversation with Dr. Jullian Martin, University of Alberta, regarding the prevalence in Tudor England of the Horatian motto that literature should "please and instruct."

[17] This is the name given by Arthur Oncken Lovejoy to the hierarchical world-view of the people of the Renaissance; he first presented his theories in the William James Lectures he gave at Harvard University in 1933, and which were published as the book, *The Great Chain of Being* (1936). For a more modern assessment of Lovejoy and the impact of his work on Renaissance studies, see *Jacob's Ladder and the Tree of Life*, Marion Leathers Kuntz and Paul Grimley Kuntz, eds (1987), a collection of essays by various scholars who examine Lovejoy's work and theories. I do not mean to contest Lovejoy's views, and find them, in their general overview of the time, more than adequate for the purposes of this discussion.

[18] This name is notably Flemish or Dutch; Greene is likely again appealing to nationalist sentiment in having a Flemish citizen, and therefore subject of the Spanish crown, defeated by an Englishman, a repeat of the naval battle with the Armada of 1588.

[19] The legend of the bronze head is a very common one for this time, and was attributed to many medieval scholars and pranksters. For a discussion of the various occult knowledge attributed to Albertus Magnus at this time, see *The Book of Secrets of Albertus Magnus*, Michael R. Best and Frank H. Brightman, eds (1973).

[20] That being said, he still wished to entertain them, as well. As Sarah Colvin (1993, 197) notes, "Scenes involving pagan rites or black magic indicate that these were as effective as audience-pullers in the seventeenth century as they are today. Even Gryphius includes—with didactic intent—an episode in which the misguided Celinde ... engages the services of a sorcerer."

[21] Many of the choral assertions in *Cardenio und Celinde* are so blunt that they cannot be read as anything other than sermons, the most obvious of which is the play-within-the-play between acts III-IV.

[22] I have chosen to translate the German "Gymnasium" as "academy", as I could find no better English word for this German educational institution; the British usually translate the term as "grammar school", but I find this phrase to be too restrictive and not sufficiently academic.

[23] Sidney Anglo (1977, 12) begins to capture the complexity of this situation when he notes that "distinctions between magic and experimental science have been increasingly blurred as historians have come to recognise the importance not only of intellectual traditions which continue to evolve, but also of those which proved ultimately to be dead-ends. There was in fact an enormous weight of medieval and Renaissance scientific writing

---

which served to confirm magical correspondences, occult innate virtues, astral influences, talismanic magic, and the operation of aerial spirits both good and bad. ... The immense vogue of almanacs and prognostications, the scope and volume of serious astrological debate, the notice taken of astrologers by princes ... all testify to the grip in which the astrologers held both popular and erudite imagination. Much of the same may be said of amulets, talismans, and images, the efficacy of which was maintained, explained, and elaborated by scientific writers from pagan antiquity to the Renaissance."

[24] It is common knowledge that much of the war can be attributed to a struggle between the Habsburg and Bourbon dynasties for dominance of central Europe; both royal houses used religion as a disguise for their political ambitions, thereby ensuring a ready supply of soldiers. For a more detailed discussion of the issues of the war, see *Europe since 1500* by J.H. Hexter (1971), *The Thirty Years War*, edited by Geoffrey Parker (1997) or *The Iron Century* by Henry Kamen (1971).

[25] While in Leiden, Gryphius even wrote a paper detailing why fire was not an element. Although we now know that he was right, only extant copies of the manuscript were accidentally burnt, proving that fire, although not an element, is still powerful, and possesses a sense of irony (Spahr 1993, 2).

[26] For a discussion of the Christian, humanist theatre in Germany and the Netherlands, and specifically, their attempts to establish a vernacular theatre tradition and the relationships between the literature of the two "nations," see James A. Parente's book, *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition* (1987).

[27] For an exploration of Gryphius' time in Italy, refer to Peter Skrine's article "Gryphius in Italy" (1994).

[28] The story originated in Spain, written by Juan Pérez de Montalván in 1624; he called his story *Sucesos y prodigos de amor en ocho novelas exemplares*. Perez's story was in turn translated, rather freely, into Italian in 1628 by Biasio Cialdini, who entitled his version *Prodigi d'amore rappresentati in varie novelle dal dottore Montalbano* (Powell 1961, lxxiv). The history of this story's transmission would make an excellent project for a comparatist, but unfortunately, it lies beyond the scope of this investigation.

[29] See Powell (1961, lxxv).

[30] For a more detailed discussion of the academic tradition of Renaissance magi, see John S. Mebane's *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age* (1989), or Frances A. Yates' classic, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (1964).

[31] While there was little direct contact between these magi, the dispersal of books enabled their writings to find a much wider audience than they otherwise would have, and at the very least influence each other's ideas, even if there is no outright passing on of the "secret knowledge" as in a master/apprentice relationship. For an excellent example of the importance of both ancient and contemporaneous writings, see Eliza M. Butler's classic study of the history of the European magus, *Ritual Magic* (1979). She focuses the first portion of her book on the Solomonic texts, their origins and how they were used by later magi (29-55). For an examination of how the Renaissance traditions evolved, see 154-82.

[32] For a classical appraisal of this era and the philosophical changes which were being effected, please see Ernst Cassirer's timeless assessment, *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* (1964), or Eugenio Garin's article "The Philospher and the Magus" (1997). For the historical precedents to these momentous changes, see Garin's *Italian Humanism* (1965).

[33] As with any major intellectual tradition, the legacy of the magi is not easily encapsulated in a few paragraphs, as demonstrated by the fact that Paul O. Kristeller wrote an entire book on the subtleties of Ficino's philosophy, and barely even touched on his followers Pico and Agrippa; for this reason, I will rely heavily on the magi's commentators as the basis for summarising their philosophies and world-views, while trying to incorporate aspects of the magi's writings into my argument.

[34] See Ficino's *Philebus Commentary*, and the accompanying introduction by Michael J.B. Allen (1975) for an example of Ficino's interpretation of Plato's writings, and their context, as illuminated in Allen's comments.

---

[35] D.P. Walker notes (1975, 42-44) that although Ficino was strongly influenced by Hermes, he always managed to avoid the issue of the spirits which figure so prominently in Hermes' writings.

[36] For a minutely detailed examination of Ficino's life and writings, please see Kristeller's *Die Philosophie des Marsilio Ficino* (1972).

[37] D.P. Walker, to name but one example, notes in his study of Ficino and his magic, that Ficino's ideas of magic were all grounded in the mass (1975, 36).

[37] As noted in Charles Boer's introduction to his translation of Ficino's *Three Books of Life* (1980).

[38] As noted in Charles Boer's introduction to his translation of Ficino's *Three Books of Life* (1980).

[39] For an introduction to Pico's ideas and philosophies, please refer to Paul Oskar Kristeller's "Introduction to Pico della Mirandola" (1948). For a traditional assessment of Pico and his role in the Renaissance, please see William G. Craven's book, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Symbol of His Age* (1981); this book is built largely upon an assessment of Pico's writings on people and humanity, such as his *On the Dignity of Man* (1965).

[40] Copenhaver and Schmitt note that although Pico's new-found knowledge of the Cabbala was influential on subsequent magi, it turns out that many of the "new" insights Pico gained into Moses' writings were caused by manipulated translations from Hebrew. Pico's knowledge of that language was insufficient for the detailed analysis needed, and his Hebraic tutor was an ex-Jew who wanted to confirm the truth of Jesus' incarnation (1992, 172).

[41] One should note and remember that Agrippa wrote a tract, translated into English as "On the Vanitie and Uncertaintie of Artes and Sciences," denouncing many of the practices he describes in his *De Occulta*. One must therefore be cautious in how much one attributes to Agrippa's writings, and make the reader question what was written for fellow occultists, and what was written to appease the ecclesiastical authorities.

[42] For a list and discussion of the various demons, as well as their respective powers and spheres of influence, see Elizabeth Butler's *Ritual Magic* (1979, especially 29-35). For a ranking of the demons in hell, in the baroque cosmology, see the "Einleitung" by Helmut Wiemken to *Die Volksbücher von D. Johann Fausti und Christoph Wagner* (1961, xlvii).

[43] Tyche's focus on dead babies is strongly reminiscent of the accusations against witches made at this time, namely, that witches killed, sacrificed or dug up babies in order to gain and maintain the power bestowed by the Devil. For a graphic description of the witches' Sabat, see the treatise by Greene and Gryphius' contemporaries, Pierre de Lancre (1550-1630), *Tableau de l'inconstance des mauvais anges et demons* (1612), or the encyclopedia of demonic activity produced slightly earlier by Jean Bodin (*c.*1530-1596): *Demonomanie des sorciers* (1580).

[44] Brian Levack (1992, 128) notes that accusations of witchcraft helped the society of this era to rationalise misfortune, providing an explanation of otherwise inexplicable events. Keith Thomas (1971, 535ff) concurs.

[45] For exact figures, see H.C. Erik Midelfort's *Witch Hunting in Southwest Germany 1582-1684* (1972). There were, of course, other witch trials occurring elsewhere until the late seventeenth century, notably in Salem, Massachusetts, and a large one in Mora, Sweden. This trial was tragically ironic, because the Swedish government and people were always a model of rationality regarding witchcraft trials in conquered territory during the Thirty Years War. For a more general discussion of the timeframe of the witch trials, see Russell's *History of Witchcraft* (1980).

[46] As noted in a classroom lecture delivered at the University of Manitoba by Mr. Victor Cowie in the academic year 1992/93.

[47] For example, Levack notes (1992, 111) that with the Church's crackdown on the remnants of "pagan" beliefs within Christianity, many people felt helpless against (potential) attacks by *maleficia*.

[48] Philip Henslowe and The Lord Strange's Men owned the rights to *Friar Bacon* until at least 1602 (Seltzer 1963, x).

Chapter 2:

[1] Even in the much more liberal and democratic years at the end of the nineteenth century, over 25 percent of the students attending German academies were the sons of university graduates; for these figures for nineteenth century Germany, see James E. Russell's *German Higher Schools* (1913). For Germany, probably even more than noted earlier for England, students would have been only from the wealthy classes or sons of the clergy, as Gryphius was, for the simple reason that no one else could afford to send their sons to school.

[2] In this respect, Miles (xv, 33-37) can be seen as a precursor, or even peer of, the figure of Caliban in Shakespeare's *The Tempest* (II, ii, 19-60). Both of these plays are concerned with magic, and both Miles and Caliban serve as earthy foils to their learned masters; each of them is more concerned with ale than with education and learning.

[3] Proof of this attitude is found in the opening of the Apostles' Creed, which is the basis for both Catholic and Protestant theology: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and Earth." The word "almighty" does not leave much room for negotiation or allowance of any sort of power greater than God.

[4] As Friedenthal notes in his study of Luther and his life, Luther turned "directly to God as the supreme authority, to God as proclaimed by the Bible, about whom no scruples could be entertained. To the end of his life the Bible remained his sole authority, nothing else had any validity" (1970, 28).

[5] See Frank Towne's article: "'White Magic' in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay?*" (1952).

[6] The time limit agreed to by Faustus and Mephistophiles in the 1587 version of the story is twenty-four years, during which time the spirit would be under Faustus' command and "alle Fragen nichts Unwahrhaftiges antworten wolles" (1961, 18). For the agreement on the length of the contract, see page 23. This version of the Faust story is, of course, in contrast to Goethe's, where Mephistopheles is obliged to serve Faust until he is pleased with life, a day which Faust bets will never come: "Kannst du mich schmeichelnd je belügen, / Daß ich mir selbst gefallen mag, / Kannst du mich mit Genuß betrügen — / Die Wette biet ich!" (1994, 1694-98)

[7] For this discussion of Tyche's name, I am indebted to the article by Thomas W. Best, "Gryphius's *Cardenio und Celinde* in Its European Context: A New Perspective" (1991, 68).

[8] See the "Historie of Fryer Bacon" in *Early Prose Romances*, edited by Henry Morley (322-25).

[9] While "comedy" can refer to events with a happy ending, it also has the connotation of referring to lowly, or common events, in this case, love, even if it is between a member of the nobility and a(n) (un)common lass. As M.H. Abrams defines it, comedy is "a work in which the materials are selected and managed primarily in order to interest, involve, and amuse us" (1988, 27). In this scenario, Bacon is effectively telling Edward to relax and enjoy the show, as nothing particularly noteworthy will happen.

[10] This technique of predicting for the past an event which has already occurred is called "vaticinium in adjecto"; this application is purely literary, and there is, to no one's surprise, no record of the historical Bacon making any such prediction.

[11] So why the Lamberts and Serlsbys must die is beyond the scope of this paper, although a theologian might speculate that it was to confirm to Bacon that he is on the road to damnation.

[12] Luther, like most of the theologians of his day, believed in predestination, or that God knew, through foreknowledge, what was going to happen to each person. If one conceives of predestination as the reformers did, namely that it "is an affirmation that despite evil and suffering the ultimate destiny of the world and history rests in the good and infallible hands of God" (Lindberg 1996, 371), then it is not surprising that following St. Augustine of Hippo's (among others) lead, both Luther and Calvin were firm believers in the doctrine of predestination. For a fuller discussion of Luther's view, from which Gryphius' are derived, refer to James Atkinson's book, *Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism* (1968, 122-23).

[13] Again, I offer as proof the article Gryphius wrote while in Leiden that fire was not an element, demonstrating that he was interested in scientific research and was not convinced that the four alchemical elements were the phsyical basis of our universe.

---

[14] See Gerhild Williams' book, *Defining Dominion* (1995, 14), where he argues that for the people at this time, commerce with higher beings through magic put one's soul "perpetually at risk."

[15] Again, as noted in Spahr's biography of Gryphius, after his death he was mourned as a "Teutsche Sophokles" (1993).

Conclusion:

[1] From which comes the long-held misnomer of "The Dark Ages" when referring to medieval times.

Selected Bibliography:

____ (1989), Oxford English Dictionary, Second Edition. Prepared by J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner, (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

_____ (1889), "The Famous Historie of Fryer Bacon" in Early Prose Romances, Henry Morley, ed. (London: George Routledge & Sons) pp 287-328.

_____ (1961), Doctor Fausti Weheklag, Die Volksbücher von D. Johann Faust und Cristoph Wagner, 1587. Edited with introduction by Helmut Wiemken. (Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag).

Abrams, M.H. (1988), A Glossary of Literary Terms, Fifth Edition. (Orlando: Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

Agrippa (von Nettesheim), Heinrich Cornelius (1921), Magische Werke in vier Bänder, eine Übersetzung von De Occulta Philosophia. (Vienna: Amonesta Verlag).

_____ (1974), Of the Vanitie and Vncertaintie of Artes and Sciences. James Sanford, trans. Catherine M. Dunn, ed. Renaissance Editions. (Northridge: California State University).

Aikin, Judith Popovich (1982), German Baroque Drama, Twayne World Author Series, #634. (Boston: Twayne Publishers).

_____ (1983), "Genre Definition and Genre Confusion in Gryphius' Double Bill: Cardenio und Celinde and Herr Peter Squentz" in Coloquia Germanica 16:1. (Bern: Francke Verlag for the University of Kentucky) pp 1-12.

Albertus Magnus (1973), The Book of Secrets of Albertus Magnus, Michael R. Best and Frank H. Brightman, eds. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Anglo, Sydney (1977), "Evident Authority and Authoritative Evidence: The Malleus Maleficarum" in The Damned Art, Sidney Anglo, ed. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul) pp 1-31.

Allen, Michael J.B. (1975), "Introduction" to Marsilio Ficino: The Philebus Commentary. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Aristotle (1989), "The Poetics", Leon Golden, trans., in The Critical Tradition, David H. Richter, ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press) pp 42-65.

Assarsson-Rizzi, Kerstin (1972), Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, A Structural and Thematic Analysis of Robert Greene's Play. Lund Studies in English. (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup).

Atkinson, James (1968), Martin Luther and the Birth of Protestantism. (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

Bacon, Thomas I. (1976), Martin Luther and the Drama. (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi).

Berghaus, Günter (1984), "Andreas Gryphius' *Carolus Stuardus* — Formkunstwerk oder Politisches Lehrstück?" in *Daphnis* 13:1-2. (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.) pp 229-41.

Best, Thomas W. (1991), "Gryphius's *Cardenio und Celinde* in Its European Context: A New Perspective" in *Literary Culture in the Holy Roman Empire, 1555-1720*. James A. Parente, Jr., Richard Erich Schade and George C. Schoolfield, eds. University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, #113. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press) pp 60-77.

_____ (1986), "'Schädliche Neigungen' in Gryphius' *Leo Armenius*" in *Neophilologus* Vol. LXX, No. 3. (Groningen: H.O. Tjeenk Willink) pp 416-28.

Bobetag, Felix (1989), *Volksbücher des 16. Jahrhunderts*, herausgegeben und erklärt von Felix Bobetag, nach der Ausgabe Berlin und Stuttgart 1887. (Georg Olms Verlag: Hildesheim).

Bodin, Jean (1580), *De la demonomanie des sorciers (On the Demon-mania of Witches)*, Randy A. Scott, trans. (Toronto: Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies, 1995).

Brauner, Sigrid (1995), *Fearless Wives and Frightened Shrews*. (Amherst, Mass: University of Massachusetts Press).

Butler, Eliza M. (1979), *Ritual Magic*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Carroll, D. Allen (1994), "Introduction" to *Greene's Groatsworth of Wit*; Medieval Texts and Renaissance Studies Vol. 114, (Binghampton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies) pp 1-38.

Cassirer, Ernst (1964), *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy*. Mario Domandi, trans. (New York: Harper & Row).

Christie-Murray, David (1976), *A History of Heresy*. (London: New English Library).

Clark, Stuart (1997), *Thinking with Demons*. (Oxford: Clarendon).

Cohen, I. Bernard (1990), "Introduction: The Impact of the Merton Thesis" in *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science*, I. Bernard Cohen, ed. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press) pp 1-111.

Collins, J. Churton (1905), "General Introduction" in *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* Vol 1. (Oxford: Clarendon) pp 1-69.

Colvin, Sarah (1993), "The Classical Witch and the Christian Martyr: Two Ideas of Woman in Hamburg Baroque Opera Libretti" in *German Life and Letters*, New Series Vol. XLVI No. 3. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993) pp 193-202.

Copenhaver, Brian P. and Charles B. Schmitt (1992), *Renaissance Philosophy*. Series: A History of Western Philosophy 3. (Oxford: OUP).

Craven, William G. (1981), *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: Symbol of His Age*. (Geneva: Librairie Droz).

Crupi, Charles W. (1986), *Robert Greene*. Twayne's English Authors Series #416. (Boston: Twayne Publishers).

Easton, Stewart C. (1970), *Roger Bacon and His Search for a Universal Science*. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).

Ficino, Marsilio (1980), *The Book Of Life*. Charles Boer, trans. (Irving: Spring Publications).

_____ (1975), *The Philebus Commentary*. M.J.B. Allen, trans. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Flint, Valerie I.J. (1991), *The Rise of Magic in Early Medieval Europe*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Frenzel, Elizabeth (1976), *Motive der Weltliteratur*, (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag).

Freidenthal, Richard (1970), *Luther, His Life and Times*, John Nowell, trans. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich).

Friedrich, Hugo (1949), *Montaigne*. (Bern: Francke Verlag).

Garin, Eugenio (1997), "The Philosopher and the Magus" in *Renaissance Characters*. Lydia G. Cochrane, trans. Eugenio Garin, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press) pp 123-53.

_____ (1965), *Italian Humanism*. Peter Munz, trans.(Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang (1986), *Faust, Der Tragödie erster Teil*. (Stuttgart: Philip Reclam jun.).

Greenblatt, Stephen J. (1980), *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Green, V.H.H. (1969), *Luther and the Reformation*. (London: Methuen & Co.).

Greene, Robert, and Henry Chettle (1994), *Greenes Groatsworth of Wit, Bought with a Million of Repentance*. Medieval Texts and Renaissance Studies Vol. 114, D. Allen Carroll, ed. (Binghampton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies).

_____ (1905), *Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* Vols. 1-2, J. Churton Collins, ed. Reprint of the 1905 Edition, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon).

_____ (1963), *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, Daniel Seltzer, ed. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).

Gurr, Andrew (1996), *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*. (Oxford: Clarendon).

Gryphius, Andreas (1961a), *Cardenio und Celinde*, Hugh Powell, ed. (Leicester: Leicester University Press).

_____, (1961b), "Cardenio und Celinde, oder Unglückliche Verliebte" in *Trauerspiele*, Band 2, Hermann Palm, editor of *Andreas Gryphius: Werke in Drei Bänden*. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung).

Guy, John (1988), *Tudor England*. (New York: Oxofrd University Press).

Hasty, Will (1989), "The Order of Chaos: On *Vanitas* in the Work of Anreas Gryphius" in *Daphnis* 18: 1. (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.) pp 145-57.

Helgerson, Richard (1976), *Elizabethan Prodigals*. (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Henry, Desmond Paul (1967), "Medieval Philosophy" in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Vol V*. Paul Edwards, ed. (New York: MacMillan & Co.) pp 252-58.

Hexter, J.H. and Richard Pipes (1971), *Europe Since 1500*. (New York: American Heritage Publishing).

Hieatt, Charles (1981), "A New Source for *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*" in *Review of English Studies 1981* Vol. 32. (Oxford: Oxford University Press) pp 180-87.

Hoffmeister, Gerhardt (1983), "The English Comedians in Germany" in *German Baroque Literature, The European Perspective*, G. Hoffmeister, ed. (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing) pp 142-58.

Houppert, Joseph W. (1975), *John Lyly*. Twayne's English Authors Series #177. (Boston: Twayne Publishers).

Jonson, Ben (1979), "The Alchemist" in *Ben Jonson's Plays and Masques*, robert M. Adams, ed. A Norton Critical Edition, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co.) pp 176-274.

Jordan, John C. (1965), *Robert Greene*. A reprint of the 1915 original. (New York: Octagon Books).

Kramer, Heinrich and Jakob Sprenger (1948), *Malleus Maleficarum*, M. Summers, trans. (London: Pushkin Press).

Kamen, Henry (1971), *The Iron Century*. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson).

Krauss, Kenneth (1993), *Private Readings/Public Texts, Playreaders' Constructs of Theatre Audiences*. (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press).

Kristeller, Paul O. (1948), "Introduction to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola" in *The Renaissance Philosophy of Man,* Ernst Cassirer, P.O. Kristeller and John Herman Randall, Jr., eds. (Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press) pp 215-22.

_____ (1972), *Die Philosophie des Marcilio Ficino*. (Frankfurt a.M.: Vittorio Klostermann,).

Kuntz, Marian Leathers and Paul Grimley Kuntz, eds. (1987), *Jacob's Ladder and the Tree of Life*, Series V, Vol. 14. (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang).

Lancre, Pierre de (1982), *Tableau de l'inconstance des mauvais anges et demons*. (Paris: Aubier).

Levack, Brian P. (1992), *The Witchhunt in Early Modern Europe*, Second Editon. (London: Longman).

Lindberg, Carter (1996), T*he European Reformers*. (London: Blackwell).

Lovejoy, Arthur Oncken (1936), *The Great Chain of Being*. Based on the William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University, 1933. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press).

Marlowe, Christopher, "The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus" in *The Complete Plays*, J.B. Steane, ed. (London: Penguin Classics, 1986) pp 263-339.

Martin, Julian (1991), "Natural philosophy and its public concerns" in *Science, culture and popular belief in Renaissance Europe*, Stephen Pumfrey, Paolo L. Rossi and Maurice Slawinski, eds. (Manchester: Manchester University Press) pp 100-118.

Mauss, Marcel (1972), *A General Theory of Magic*, Robert Brain, trans. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Mannack, Eberhard (1968), *Andreas Gryphius*. (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung).

McGowan, Margaret M. (1977), "Pierre de Lancre's *Tableau de l'inconstance des mauvais anges et demons*: The Sabat Sensationalised" in *The Damned Art*, Sydney Anglo, ed. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul) pp 182-201.

Mebane, John S. (1989), *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).

Metzger, Michael M. and Erika A. Metzger (1994), *Reading Andreas Gryphius: Critical Trends 1664-1993* (Columbia, SC: Camden House).

_____, (1983), "The Thirty Years' War and Its Impact on Literature" in *German Baroque Literature, The European Perspective*, G. Hoffmeister, ed. (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing) pp 38-51.

Midelfort, H.C. Erik (1972), *Witch Hunting in Southwestern Germany 1562-1684*. (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Müller, Johannes (1930), *Das Jesuitendrama in den Ländern deutscher Zunge vom Anfang (1555) bis zum Hochbarock (1665).* Schriften zur Deutschen Literatur, Band 7, Günther Müller, ed. (Augsburg: Dr. Benno Filser Verlag).

Palmer, P.M. and R.P. More (1965), *The Sources of the Faust Tradition* (New York: Haskell House).

Parente, James A. Jr. (1987), *Religious Drama and the Humanist Tradition*. (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Parker, Geoffrey, ed. (1997), *The Thirty Years' War,* Second Edition. (London: Routledge).

Pico, Giovanni della Mirandola (1977), *Heptaplus, or Discourse on the Seven Days of Creation*, Jessie Brewer McGaw, trans. (New York: Philosophical Library).

_____ (1965), *On the Dignity of Man and Other Works*, Charles G. Wallis, trans. The Library of the Liberal Arts. (New York: Bobbs-Merrill).

Powell, Hugh (1961), "Introduction" to *Cardenio und Celinde*. (Leicester: Leicester University Press) pp xi-lxxix.

Roper, Lyndal (1994), *Oedipus and the Devil.* (London: Routledge).

Russell, James E. (1913), *German Higher Schools*. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.).

Russell, Jeffrey B. (1986), *Mephistopheles, The Devil in the Modern World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 1.

_____ (1980), *A History of Witchcraft, Sorcerers, Heretics, and Pagans*. (London: Thames & Hudson).

Sagarra, Eda and Peter Skrine (1997), *A Companion to German Literature from 1500 to the Present*. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).

Seltzer, Daniel (1963), "Introduction" to Greene's *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press) pp ix-xxi.

Shakespeare, William, "The Tempest" in *The Complete Works*, G.B. Harrison, ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, no date) pp 1475-1501.

Shattuck, Roger (1996), *Forbidden Knowledge*. (New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.).

Shumaker, Wayne (1972), *The Occult Sciences in the Renaissance: A Study in Intellectual Patterns*. (London: University of California Press).

Skrine, Peter (1994), "Gryphius in Italy" in *Travel Fact and Travel Fiction*, Zweder von Martels, ed. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History Vol. 55. (Leiden: E.J. Brill) pp 170-82.

_____ (1991), "German Baroque Drama and Seventeenth-Century European Theatre" in *Literary Culture in the Holy Roman Empire, 1555-1720*, James A. Parente, Jr., Richard Erich Schade and George C. Schoolfield, eds. University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic Languages and Literatures, #113. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press) pp 49-59.

Spahr, Blake Lee (1993), *Andreas Gryphius: A Modern Perspective*. (Columbia: Camden House).

_____,"Cardenio und Celinde" in *Problems and Perspectives: A Collection of Essays on German Baroque Literature*, Hans-Gert Roloff, ed. for "Arbeiten zur Mittleren Deutschen Literatur und Sprache, Nr. 9". (Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang, 1981) pp 131-50.

Steane, J.B. (1986), "Introduction" to *Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays*, J.B. Steane, ed. (London: Penguin) pp 9-37.

Stiftung Gerhart-Hauptmann-Haus, ed. (1993), *Andreas Gryphius: Weltgeschick und Lebenszeit: Ein schlesischer Barockdichter aus deutscher und polnischer Sicht*. (Düsseldorf: Droste).

Summers, Montague (1948), "Introduction" to Kramer's *Malleus Maleficarum*. (London: Pushkin Press).

Szyrocki, Marian (1964), *Andreas Gryphius, Sein Leben und Werk*, (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag).

Terrell, et al. (1990), *Collins' German-English English-German Dictionary*. (Glasgow: William Collins & Sons).

Thomas, Keith V. (1971), *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons).

Thorndike, Lynn (1951), *A History of Magic and Experimental Science, Vol. V— The Sixteenth Century*. History of Science Society Publications, New Series IV. (New York: Columbia University Press).

Towne, Frank (1952), "'White Magic' in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*?" in *Modern Language Notes Vol 67*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press) pp 9-13.

Trismegistus, Hermes (1924), *Hermetica,* W. Scott, trans. (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Veeser, H. Aram (1989), *The New Historicism*. (New York: Routledge).

Walker, D.P. (1975), *Spiritual and Demonic Magic from Ficino to Campanella*, a reprint of the 1957 Warburg Institute edition. (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press).

Wertheim, Albert (1974), "The Presentation of Sin in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*" in *Criticism, Fall 1974*. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press) pp 273-86.

West, Robert H. (1939), *The Invisible World, A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama*. (Athens: University of Georgia Press).

Wiemken, Helmut (1961), "Einleitung" to *Doctor Fausti Weheklag, Die Volksbücher von D. Johann Faust und Cristoph Wagner, 1587*. Helmut Wiemken, ed. (Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag) pp ix-lxxiii.

Williams, Gerhild Scholz (1995), *Defining Dominion*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Williams, John (1970), *Theatres and Audiences*. (London: Longman).

Wilson, Richard, "Introduction: Historicising New Historicism" in *New Historicism and Renaissance Drama*, Richard Wilson and Richard Dutton, eds. (London: Longman, 1992) pp 1-18.

Wrightson, Keith (1982), *English Society 1580-1680*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press).

Yates, Frances A. (1979), *The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age*. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

_____ (1964), *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*. (London: University of Chicago Press).